Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs

ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

Volume Five

Answers to Liturgical Questions

In Appreciation

Publication of this work was made possible
in part through the generosity of:

John, Tina, and Emmanuel J. Melonakos, M.D.

and

FAITH: An Endowment for Orthodoxy and Hellenism

FAITH
An Endowment for
Orthodoxy & Hellenism

We deeply appreciate and are grateful for their support.

Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs:

A Complete and Annotated Translation

(Based on the 1st Edition of Apostolikē Diakonia)

Volume 5
Questions 501–600

General Editor and Translator
Patrick Viscuso

Associate Editors and Translators
John Margetis, Anton Vrame

Contributors
Patrick Viscuso and John Margetis

HOLY CROSS
ORTHODOX PRESS
Brookline, Massachusetts

Published by Holy Cross Orthodox Press
Hellenic College, Inc.
50 Goddard Avenue Brookline, MA 02445
© Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Anton Vrame, 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise with the prior permission of Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

ISBN
978-1-935317-91-3 (vol 5)
978-1-935317-93-7 1-935317-93-8 SET

The copyright holder of the books *Απαντήσεις εις λειτουργικάς απορίας* by Ioannis Foundoulis is Apostoliki Diakonia. This translation has been licensed by Apostoliki Diakonia for the First (1st Edition). All rights reserved.

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Provided by Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.)

Names:
Phountoulēs, Iōannēs M., 1927-2007, author. | Viscuso, Patrick, 1956- editor, translator. | Margetis, John, editor, translator. | Vrame, Anton C., editor, translator. | Houpos, Andreas, contributor. | Papiris, Dionysios, contributor.

Title:
Answers to liturgical questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs : a complete and annotated translation / general editor and translator, Patrick Viscuso ; associate editors and translators: John Margetis, Anton Vrame ; contributors, Andreas Houpos and Dionysios Papiris.

Other titles:
Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. English

Description:
First English edition. | Brookline, Massachusetts : Holy Cross Orthodox Press, [2023] | Translation of: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers:
ISBN: 978-1-935317-93-7 (set) | 978-1-935317-87-6 (v. 1) | 978-1-935317-88-3 (v. 2) | 978-1-935317-89-0 (v. 3) | 978-1-935317-90-6 (v. 4) | 978-1-935317-91-3 (v. 5) | 978-1-935317-92-0 (v. 6)

Subjects:
LCSH: Orthodox Eastern Church--Liturgy--History. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Doctrines. | Sacraments--Orthodox Eastern Church. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Apologetic works.

Classification:
LCC: BX350.A5 V57 2023 | DDC: 264/.019009--dc23

CONTENTS

Abbreviations vi
Translation of the Original Title Page xi
Prologue xiii
Questions and Answers 1

Abbreviations

AASS—*Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur* (Antwerp: 1643).

ANF—A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers Down to 325 A.D.*, 10 vols. (1885–1887; Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1989).

BDAG—Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Benešević—Vladimir Benešević, "Отвѣты Петра Хартофилакса," Записки императорской академии наукъ, vol. VIII no. 14 St. Petersburg 1909.

Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*—René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966).

Cambridge—J. Diggle, B. L. Fraser, P. James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, S. J. Westripp, eds., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

CPG—Maurice Geerard, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–1987).

Dēmētrakos—Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, ed., *Μέγα λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 15 vols (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκδόσεις Δόμη, 1964).

DOP—*Dumbarton Oaks Papers.*

Galadza—Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

GCS—*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte.*

Goar, Εὐχολόγιον—J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Græcorum complectens ritus et ordines Divinæ Liturgiæ, officiorum, sacramentorum, consecrationum, benedictionum, funerum, orationum, etc. cuilibet personae, statui vel tempori congruos, juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae… editio secunda expurgata, et accuratior* (Venice: Bartholomew Javarina, 1730).

Lampe—G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

Larin—Vassa Larin, *The Byzantine Hierarchical Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitawrij*, OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2010).

LBG—Erich Trapp, ed., *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik VI/1-8 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994–2017).

Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople—Les Regestes du Patriarcat de Constantinople (Le Patriarcat Byzantine, Série I): vol. 1, *Les Actes de Patriarches*. fasc, 1, *Les Regestes de 381 à 715*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1972); vol. 1, fasc. 2-3, *Les Regestes de 715 à 1206*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1989); vol. 1, fasc. 4, *Les Regestes de 1208 à 1309*, by Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1971); vol. 1, fasc. 5, *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1977); vol. 1, fasc. 6, *Les Regestes de 1377 à 1410, by Jean Darrouzès* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1979); vol. fasc. 7, *Les Regestes de 1410 à 1453*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1991). (References are to the documents, which are numbered in chronological order consecutively throughout).

LSJ—Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Mansi—Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*.

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome I, Le Cycle des Douze Mois*, OCA 165 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962).

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome II, Le Cycle des Fêtes Mobiles*, OCA 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1963).

NETS—Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

OCA—Orientalia Christiana Analecta.

OCD—Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).

OCP—*Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*

ODB—Alexander P. Kazhdan et al, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium,* 3 vols. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*—Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

PG—J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca,* 161 vols. in 166 pts. (Paris: 1857–1866).

RSV—Revised Standard Version.

Rhallēs and Potlēs—Γ.Α. Ῥάλλης καὶ Μ. Ποτλῆς, *Σύνταγμα θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων τῶν τε Ἁγίων καὶ Πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν Οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν Συνόδων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος Ἁγίων Πατέρων,* 6 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Γ. Χαρτοφύλαξ, 1852–1859).

SC—Sources Chrétiennes.

Simmons, *St. Symeon*—Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984).

Sophocles—E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914).

Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*—Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law—Wilfred Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, eds., *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012).

Thomas and Hero—John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero, eds., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments,* 5 vols. (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000).

Tolika—Ὀλυμπία Τολικά, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993).

Woodfin—Warren T. Woodfin, *The Embodied Icon, Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν*—Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν: Περιέχουσα Λόγους ψυχωφελεστάτους δεκατρεῖς, ῥυθμίζοντας ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τὰ κακὰ ἤθη τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας Ἐντολὰς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης* (*Morality for Christians: Containing thirteen Orations profiting the soul, which educate to improve the bad morals of Christians. And in addition, also the authoritative Commandments of the Old and New Testaments*) (Venice: Ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Νικολάου Γλυκὺ τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1803).

ΘΗΕ—*Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 12 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀθαν. Μαρτίνος, 1962–1968).

ΜΕΕ—Παῦλος Δρανδάκης, ed., *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 24 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Πυρσός, 1927–1934).

Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*—Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898).

Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*—Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923).

Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935).

Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей—А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).

IŌANNĒS M. PHOUNTOULĒS

ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

Volume 5

501–600

5th Edition

IN MEMORY OF

MICHAĒL AND MARIA

PHOUNTOULĒS

Prologue

With the grace and the goodwill of God, this fifth volume of *Answers to Liturgical Questions* is published, which contains the sixth set of one hundred answers from the 501st up until the 600th. These cover an entire decade of collaboration with the periodical *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* from issue 1/15 of April 1993 up until the issue of January 2003. As during the previous reprintings, so also now, basically the text remains the same, but minor improvements, additions, or corrections are done, where this is judged necessary.

The "perplexities" in the topics of divine worship are many, too many. The six hundred questions up until now proved it, to which the best answer as possible was given, no thanks to the knowledge and wisdom of the writer, but after laborious study and research of the sources, which themselves alone authentically can solve our small or large problems. And the road is safe and secure for our fathers and brothers who question us, since certainly questioning is an indication of interest regarding sacred matters and of unhypocritical humility. But the humility and love of the one who answers is put to the test, a snare from which only the prayers of brothers can appear as deliverers and helpers. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki likewise faces a similar situation, giving glory to God, the bestower of perfect gifts, and thanking Him both for those who humbly ask and for him who, while doing obedience, dares to answer.

Heading in this way we arrived at six hundred answers to an equal number of questions. The roundness of the number would have been a good opportunity for the series of questions and answers to conclude, had not new questions, which do exist, as well as the advice of respected persons, imposed the continuation of the effort as a work of obedience. In any case, it would be desirable, where God gives and anticipates the number of answers, that it be completed with a general alphabetical index by subject for the entire series, in order for

the searching and finding of what is sought to be easily accessible, a matter which now is quite difficult with the existence of five individual indexes by volume.[1]

With these thoughts prefacing this fifth volume, with the assistance of God, I ask for the readers while they give glory to God for anything good, to be lenient regarding the deficiencies and mistakes of the writer.

I.M.Ph.

November 26, 2003
On the commemoration of the New Martyr
Geōrgios of Chios,
Guardian of Kydōnies

1. In response to the author's wishes, the translators provided a comprehensive index to all five volumes in a sixth volume.

Questions and Answers

501

After the dismissal of the penitential Vespers of the Sundays of Great Lent and prior to "O Good One, you are the guardian of all...,"[2] is "Let us pray..."[3] said, as in Compline and the Midnight Office, or not?

"Let us pray..." fulfills the lack of a great synaptē ("litany of peace") in the services of the Midnight Office and Compline. For precisely this reason, also, it contains the slightly modified entreaties of the synaptē, as can be confirmed from a cursory comparison of the two texts. The service of Vespers has a litany of peace; consequently, "Let us pray" is not said. It would constitute a duplication of essentially the same element of the service.

Indeed, the question changes to why both these services (Compline and Midnight Office) lack litanies of peace. The more likely explanation can be given from the private character that both must have originally had. For this reason, also, the participation of the priest in them—certainly in comparison to Vespers and Matins—appears noticeably reduced. On the one hand, regarding Compline, we know that in the Monastery of Saint Sabas, which played a decisive role in the formation of the monastic services, it was chanted "in the cells,"[4] consequently privately, without the participation of a priest.[5] The Typikon of the Triōdion also attests to it in the service of Clean Monday: "The service of Compline in the Monastery of the Lavra is not chanted in the church, but each one reads these things in the

2. "Πάντων προστατεύεις ἀγαθή."
3. "Εὐξώμεθα..."
4. "ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις."
5. On the Sabaitic tradition and the Monastery of Saint Sabas, see the discussion in the notes to question 517.

cells." Obviously "Let us pray..." is not an element of the Sabaitic tradition, since it presupposes a synaxis and common prayer with a presence of a priest. Conversely, the prayer "O Lord, pardon those who hate and wrong us...,"[6] which contains the same entreaties as the preceding "Let us pray..." from another tradition, must be an original element of the rite of Saint Sabas. The fact that it is a private prayer is apparent also from its content and from the standard rubric that is usually prefixed in Hōrologia: "We depart into our cells, where we also say this prayer: 'O Lord, pardon those who hate and wrong us....'" It is clear that this concerns a duplication or compromise of the two traditions. In the original phase of their encounter, "Let us pray..." was said if a priest was present, but if not, "O Lord, pardon those who hate and wrong us..." was said. This is also expressly attested to by the *Codex Vatopediou 1235* from the sixteenth century: "When there is a priest, he says in this manner ['Let us pray']; but if not, say: 'O Lord, pardon those who hate and wrong us....'"

Moreover, the contemporary form of the Midnight Office must again be of private origin and use, since the ancient Midnight Office of the common service,[7] by all indications, was the first part of the present service of Matins up until Psalm 50, which is not included.

Something parallel also exists in the services of the Hours, but we will speak about this in the next answer.

502

Why is "Lord have mercy"[8] said in different services sometimes once, and on other occasions three, twelve, and forty times, or even 100 times at the Exaltation of the Precious Cross?

Some things in divine worship are not understood unless we know the manner and the presuppositions of the thinking of human beings from the ancient era. Nowadays, numbers, barring exceptions,

6. "Τοῖς μισοῦσι καὶ ἀδικοῦσιν ἡμᾶς συγχώρησον, Κύριε..."

7. "τῆς κοινῆς ἀκολουθίας." For monasteries and convents, "common services" are those held together by the entire brotherhood or sisterhood, and not "in the cells."

8. "Κύριε, ἐλέησον."

do not have the significance that they had during that time. They do not regulate our actions and piety, at least to the degree and extent that they influenced it nearly two thousand years ago, at the time when the foundations of our liturgical practice were laid. The Pythagoreans had developed an entire theology concerning numbers, an echo of which we also find in the Christian tradition. And in the Old Testament as well as in the New, especially in the Revelation of John, and in Christian theology and popular piety, certain numbers are particularly charged with sacred content and symbolism, such as one, three, four, seven, eight, twelve, and forty. And even nowadays, despite the change of mentality through the influence of the sciences, three continues to preserve its sacredness as a symbol of the Holy Trinity and thirteen continues to be considered a sinister magic number by many. Let us also recall the uproar that was created around the number 666.[9]

Especially regarding three, twelve, or forty "Lord have mercies" in our services, numbers that certainly cannot be random, we will only reference explanations that are given by Saint Markos Eugenikos and Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki. They not only reveal for us the meaning that in retrospect was given for the justification of the preference for these numbers, but certainly also what inherently influenced their selection. Thus, Saint Markos justifies the "twelve" "Lord have mercies," where he says that this is done after the Lord's Prayer, "in representation...of the apostles, to whom first this divine prayer has been given" and "forty times," because "the number [is]...honored..., since God is propitiated by fasting for so many days" (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*, Concerning the Midnight Office).[10] According to Saint Symeōn, "'Lord have mercy' is

9. Since the 1980s and especially into the 1990s, increasing concern about barcodes and their association with the word "χάραγμα" (the mark of the beast, namely, the number 666, cf. Rev 13:16–17, 14:9, 14:11, 15:2, 16:2, 19:20, 20:4) has resulted in public demonstrations, outcries, and debates in Greece. This concern has centered on the use of barcodes on forms of identification such as passports and national identification cards.

10. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*) (PG 160:1171b, 1173d). Saint Markos Eugenikos (Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός), (ca. 1392–1445), Metropolitan of Ephesos (r. 1437–1445), became the chief theological spokesman for the Orthodox legation at

said twelve times on account of the twelve hours of the day and the twelve hours of the night, for our sanctification and purification from sins during them" (*Dialogue*, chapters 326 and 305)[11] "and... forty in sanctification of the entire time of our life; for the forty days, in which there is the great fast, a tithing, as some say,[12] of the three hundred sixty five days; and, forty 'Lord have mercies' at each time of prayer for a blotting out of our many untold sins in every day and hour" (*Dialogue*, chapter 325)[13] or "we present to God as a sacrifice of a tithing of our days and hours" (*Dialogue*, chapter 308).[14] The three time repetition is a commonplace that is done in honor of the three persons of the Holy Trinity.

"Lord have mercy" is said one hundred times at every single one of the five Exaltations of the Precious Cross, as well as at entreaties of the Litē of Great Vespers. This number is taken either for a statement of infinity, as also in the contemporary popular expression, "I said it" or "I did it one hundred times,"[15] or has a pre-Christian origin. The words "ἐπ' ἀγαθά,"[16] or "βοήθ[ε]ια"[17] when added in numerical values give us 100: (ε'=)5 + (π'=)80 + (α'=)1 + (γ'=)3 + (α'=)1 + (θ'=)9 + (α'=)1=100 and (β'=)2 + (ο'=)70 + (η'=)8 + (θ'=)9 + (ι'=)10 + (α'=)1=100. Thus, the combination of a cross and the Greek number ρ' (=100) in the monogram of Christ was interpreted as meaning,

---

the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439), where he refused to sign the decree of union with the Roman Catholics. He is the author of an extensive number of theological, polemical, exegetical, liturgical, and spiritual works, as well as letters, most of which remain unedited and scattered in manuscripts. This brief overview is based on the extensive study, Nicholas Constas, "Mark Eugenikos," in *La Théologie Byzantine et Sa Tradition*, ed. Camello Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2002), 2:411–475.

11. PG 155:592a, 557c.

12. Among those who hold this view was the sixth/seventh century Saint Dōrotheos of Gaza. For a text of Saint Dōrotheos on Great Lent as a tithing, see Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Τιμίου Προδρόμου, *Ἀββᾶ Δωροθέου, Ἔργα Ἀσκητικά: Εἰσαγωγή, Κείμενο, Μετάφραση, Σχόλια, Πίνακες* (Καρέας: Ἐκδόσεις "Ἑτοιμασία," 2000), 348–351.

13. PG 155:589c.

14. PG 155:560c.

15. "τὸ εἶπα" ἤ "τὸ ἔκαμα ἑκατὸ φορές."

16. "for a good end."

17. "help."

"ὁ σταυρὸς [ἢ ὁ Χριστός] εἶναι ἡ βοήθειά μας" (the cross [or Christ] is our help).

In services, now, of the daily office, where twelve or forty "Lord have mercies" are encountered, we do not simply have a random use of sacred numbers, only for the sacredness of the number. At first glance, they serve an inconspicuous liturgical purpose. These services (Midnight Office, Hours, Mesōria, Typika, and Compline) are purely of monastic origin and have the possibility to be celebrated jointly in the monastic brotherhoods, but also in an eremitical fashion,[18] by many or by one, with the participation or without the participation of a priest. For this reason, also, the role of the priest, even if he is present, is considerably reserved. The most characteristic example is the service of the typika (namely, according to the form of the Liturgy), which includes whatever the people said during the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, namely, according to the taxis of the Jerusalemite liturgical tradition, from which are derived the services of the daily cycle.[19] The services that we mentioned above do not have a litany of peace and ektenēs for the reason that we already said. It is, I believe, beyond doubt that the litany of peace is replaced with the twelve "Lord have mercies," the "great 'Lord have mercy,'"[20] namely the ektenēs with forty, but also possibly the small synaptē with three "Lord have mercies." Nearly as many are the repetitions of "Lord have mercy" in corresponding instances with a tendency of

18. "κελλιωτικῶς." The sense of the solitary or idiorrhythmic life is rendered here as "in an eremitical fashion." This adverb can also be understood as equivalent to the expression, "in the cells" ("ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις"), Lampe, s.v. "κελλίον, τό." The contrast is between large, organized brotherhoods in monasteries, and one or more ascetics resident in a κελλίον, which can be a monastic cell or even a small cottage.

19. For an introduction and text of this Liturgy, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 65–146. For a critical edition of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, see B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 5–142. In addition, most recently, see Ἀλκιβιάδης Κ. Καζαμίας, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Θεοβαδίστου Ὄρους Σινᾶ, Ἁγία Αἰκατερίνη, 2006), where there is a prologue by Phountoulēs and a critical review of prior editions.

20. τὸ "μέγα 'Κύριε, ἐλέησον.'"

rounding or approximation to the nearest sacred number. In other words, the response of the people is also preserved here, as well as in the service of the typika, and the priestly or diaconal command is absent, either since a priest did not always participate or in order that the possibility of the private use of the service is provided.

503

Why are the iambic katabasies for the feast of Pentecost chanted first and not the pezes,[21] as at Nativity and Theophany?

Indeed, during the forefeast period for the Nativity, the heirmoi of the so-called "pezos"[22] canon of this feast, "Christ is born…"[23] and so forth, are chanted as katabasies, and during the forefeast period for Theophany, "The Lord mighty in wars…"[24] and so forth, which are the heirmoi of the "pezos" canon of Theophany, are similarly chanted, apart from January 1st when the double katabasies ("The Lord mighty in wars…" and "Israel treads…"[25]) are chanted, obviously for the more festive character of the day. Conversely, during the forefeast period for the Sunday of Pentecost from the Ascension onwards, the iambic katabasies ("Covered with divine darkness…")[26] are chanted and not the "pezes" ("With the sea he covered…")[27] of the canons for the feast. During the afterfeast day, on the Monday of the Holy Spirit, and up until Saturday, the iambics are again chanted. And as to the second period, the three cases are absolutely similar; the iambic katabasies are chanted after the feast. However, this emphasizes the peculiarity even more as to the preference of the

21. The pezes katabasies are those written in more common or plain style (prose), while the iambic katabasies follow a meter having roots in classical poetry and use elevated speech.

22. "πεζοῦ."

23. "Χριστὸς γεννᾶται…"

24. "Βυθοῦ ἀνεκάλυψε…"

25. "Στίβει θαλάσσης…" The full text of the katabasia reads, "Στίβει θαλάσσης, κυματούμενον σάλον, ἤπειρον αὔθις, Ἰσραὴλ δεδειγμένον, μέλας δὲ πόντος, τριστάτας Αἰγυπτίων, ἔκρυψεν ἄρδην, ὑδατόστρωτος τάφος, ῥώμῃ κραταιᾷ, δεξιᾶς τοῦ Δεσπότου."

26. "Θείῳ καλυφθείς…"

27. "Πόντῳ ἐκάλυψε…"

iambic katabasies in an exceptional manner also during the forefeast days of Pentecost.

I have the impression that the only possible explanation, which as I believe would satisfactorily justify the reason for this exception, is the preference for the fourth tone of the iambic katabasies versus the grave of the "pezes," namely, reasons of musical choice. It can be generally established that the grave tone is avoided in the canons, as well as in the troparia, except if the sequence of the cycle in the use of the tones requires it, such as in the Paraklētikē. Especially in Renewal Week, where due to the number of days (seven) one of the eight tones should be skipped during the daily alternation of the tones, grave is omitted. For this reason, in comparison with the other tones neither does it have many automela or heirmoi. In any case, it is peculiar because Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer[28] does not omit the grave tone in the sequence of canons for the feasts of the Lord, which he composed programmatically with regard to tones (first tone – Nativity; second tone – Theophany; third tone – Meeting of Christ; fourth tone – Palm Sunday; plagal of the first – Ascension; grave – Pentecost; plagal of the fourth – Exaltation of the Precious Cross). He likely considers the plagal of the second being used in Great Week (triōdia of Great Thursday and Great Friday, and tetraōdion of Great Saturday) as more appropriate for it,[29] and grave as required, in some manner, by the sequence of tones for the Sundays of Pentecost (first tone – Antipascha;[30] second – Myrrhbearers; third – Paralytic; fourth – Samaritan; plagal of the first – Blind man; plagal of the fourth – All Saints).[31] The compilers of the Typikon thought differently. They were free in demonstrating their lack of preference for the grave tone and showed it.

28. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).

29. Great Week.

30. The Sunday of Thomas.

31. In other words, the plagal of the second already having been used to exhaustion during Great Week, and the sequence having covered all the other tones, Phountoulēs believes that Saint Kosmas felt obligated to choose the grave tone for Pentecost. Plagal of the second is frequently selected for troparia that accompany subjects of compunction and lamentation. Such famous troparia from Great Week include "Ἐξέδυσάν με τὰ ἱμάτιά μου..." and also "Σήμερον κρεμᾶται ἐπὶ ξύλου..." in Matins of Great Friday.

504

Is it correct during the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost for the three troparia that the Pentēkostarion has ("Today, all the nations saw astounding things...")[32] not to be chanted twice alone, but for the first three of the Vespers of the feast from the first tone ("We are celebrating Pentecost...")[33] to precede?[34]

I do not know from where this practice drew its start, but I see that lately it is commonly practiced by many. They invoke the exceptional beauty of the first three troparia of the Vespers for the feast and the saturation caused by the double repetition of the troparia, which indeed have been chanted a short time before at lauds. In any event, the Pentēkostarion and the Typika provide for the double chanting of the three troparia, idiomela of the fourth tone, "Today, all the nations saw astounding things...," "The Holy Spirit always was...,"[35] and "The Holy Spirit, light and life...."[36] I do not believe that this is randomly done. The reference to the event of the visitation of the Holy Spirit in the first troparion and its theological encomium in the two other troparia certainly better suits the festal calendar subject of the Monday, the Holy Spirit, than the troparia of the Vespers of the feast, which are generally referring to the subject of Pentecost. Obviously also the fourth tone as more festive is preferred to the first, and the Vespers of Kneeling has this strong element.[37] Speaking about the repetition of the same troparia, this must also be intentional since the compilers of the Typikon had the opportunity to move very comfortably in their selections among the wealth of troparia for Pentecost. The repetition of troparia, when it does not reach extremes, also has its own elegance and purpose. Namely, it assists in the absorption of the content of the hymns and

32. "Παράδοξα σήμερον..."
33. "Πεντηκοστὴν ἑορτάζομεν..."
34. The question is citing a tendency to borrow three troparia from the Vespers of the feast, in order to fulfill the rubric for six troparia to be chanted but simultaneously to avoid repetition that appears to some as problematic.
35. "Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἦν μὲν ἀεί..."
36. "Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον φῶς καὶ ζωή..."
37. This appears to be a subjective opinion regarding the fourth tone as being more festive than the first.

in their better understanding by the people, who do not have either books or much theological and even grammatical knowledge. For these reasons, this initiative, which in addition contributes to the slackening of liturgical discipline, would not be worthy of imitation. The taxis has been thus crystalized and let us respect it for the preservation of liturgical cohesion, which disintegrates with arbitrary personal initiatives. In this regard, there exist other troparia, many and good. What will regulate their choice if the preference of the Pentēkostarion is not considered obligatory, in some way, by the performers of sacred chanting? We will be led into anarchy.

Without being considered a ground of appeal or relativization of what was written above and with the hope that it will not have imitators, I simply note for the history of the matter what is otherwise self-evident, that the practice was not as monolithic as it appears. For example, the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (twelfth century) provides six troparia at "Lord, I have cried to you"[38] for the Vespers of Kneeling: three of the fourth tone and three of the second for the Vespers of the feast "once"[39] ("In the prophets, proclaiming to us a way of salvation…,"[40] "We have seen the true light…,"[41] "In your courts, I will sing praises to you…"[42]), and "In your courts, I will sing praises to you…" at "Glory both now."[43]

505

Is the gospel reading for the Divine Liturgy during the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross interrupted at "inclining his head he gave up his spirit,"[44] as the Typikon records, or does

38. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ…"
39. "πρὸς μίαν."
40. "Ἐν τοῖς Προφήταις ἀνήγγειλας ἡμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας…"
41. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν…"
42. "Ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς σου…"
43. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 658–663.
44. John 19:30.

it continue up until "his testimony is true,"[45] as all the old Gospel books have it?

According to the manuscripts, the old printed Evangelistaria, and Typika, the pericope is continued up until "his testimony." The Slavic printed editions also have the same thing. As far as I know, the rubric for the omission of the end of the pericope is encountered for the first time in the Typikon of Violakēs[46] and in the modern *Calendar-Typika,* and adopted by certain of the newest printings of the Gospel books. The oikonomos Geōrgios Rēgas of blessed memory notes, comments, and considers that the omission is "improper" and was done arbitrarily and "without sufficient reason," while "deliberately and correctly, not without purpose and at random" the reading had been prescribed to extend up until "his testimony" (*Questions of the Typikon*, Athens 1954, pp. 58–59).[47]

Indeed, no one can justify the omission of these five last verses of the pericope (John 19:31–35a). If it was done for reasons of saving time, the gain is insignificant. If they were considered irrelevant to the subject of the feast, then the omission is pointless. During the feast of the Exaltation, we commemorate the Lord's passions on the cross as a whole, the Crucifixion, and the lancing, which was the affirmation of the death, in contemporary terminology, "the coup de grâce."[48] Apart from the cross, the lance was also honored, which was stored in the temple of the Theotokos of the Pharos in Constantinople and was raised during the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and set out for veneration. Troparia of the feast also refer to this subject, such as the first of sixth ode of the forefeast canon of

45. John 19:35.

46. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 76.

47. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 58–59. Geōrgios Rēgas (1884–1961), a native of Skiathos, studied there and in Athens, was ordained in 1920, exercised pastoral and teaching responsibilities, and was eventually honored with the ecclesiastical office of oikonomos. His scholarship included special studies focused on the liturgical life of Skiathos and extensive works dealing with the Typikon. See the discussion of Phountoulēs in the introduction of Γεώργιος Ρήγας, ed., *Τυπικόν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1994), 7–10.

48. "ἡ χαριστικὴ βολή."

Saint Germanos, which is chanted during the eve ("O Cross, the creator whose side is pierced upon you while voluntarily hanging drains blood and water…"),[49] the afterfeast stichēra and aposticha, which are repeatedly sung ("The lance with the Cross, the nails and the other things, with which the life–bringing body of Christ was fastened, while exalting let us venerate"[50] from September 17 and 18; "I honor your cross, O Good one, the nails, and the lance, O Savior…"[51] from September 18 and 20; "Nailed on the cross for me, O my supremely good Savior…and pierced with a lance…"[52] from September 18 and 20), and certainly the second troparion of the third ode and the second one of the eighth ode of the canon for the feast by Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer ("When your immaculate side was pierced with a lance, water with blood flowed forth, inaugurating a covenant and washing away sins…" and "You earthborn hands, stewards of grace, with due reverence exalt the cross whereon Christ our God stood, and the lance that pierced the Body of God the Word…").[53]

The pericope has not been chosen randomly, nor is it used here while borrowed from another feast or from the sequence of pericopes of the Evangelistarion, as happens in many instances. It has been created specifically for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross with much attention and thought. In its introduction, the narrative of John (11:47) and Matthew (26:59) is blended and continues from chapter nineteen of the Gospel according to John, summarizing verses and "passing over" others, to give a brief as

49. "Νυγεὶς ἐπὶ σοὶ πλευρὰν ὁ κτίστης, Σταυρέ, ἐθελουσίως ἀναρτώμενος, αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ ἀποκενοῖ…"

50. "Λόγχην σὺν τῷ Σταυρῷ, τοὺς ἥλους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ἐν οἷς τὸ ζωηφόρον, Χριστοῦ ἐπάγη σῶμα, ὑψοῦντες προσκυνήσωμεν."

51. "Τιμῶ σου τὸν Σταυρόν, ἀγαθέ, τοὺς ἥλους καὶ τὴν λόγχην, Σωτήρ…"

52. "Σταυρῷ προσηλωθεὶς δι' ἐμέ, Σωτήρ μου ὑπεράγαθε…καὶ λόγχῃ ἐκεντήθης…"

53. "Πλευρᾶς ἀχράντου λόγχῃ τρωθείσης, ὕδωρ σὺν αἵματι ἐξεβλήθη ἐγκαινίζον διαθήκην καὶ ρυπτικὸν ἁμαρτίας…," "Γηγενεῖς παλάμαις οἰκονόμοι τῆς χάριτος, Σταυρὸν οὗ ἔστη Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὑψοῦτε ἱεροπρεπῶς καὶ Λόγχην Θεοῦ σῶμα ἀντιτορήσασαν…" Translation adapted from Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The September Menaion* (Boston, MA: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 2005), 138, 140.

possible summary of the saving passions. This is intentionally concluded with the lancing and masterfully in some manner signed with the unfeigned assurance of the evangelist eyewitness of the events. In its own manner, the ecclesiastical hymnography comments on this pericope. This singular pericope is already encountered in the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the ninth century (*Codices Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*), naturally complete with the narrative of the passions up until "and his testimony is true." We quote the relevant excerpt from this venerable Typikon of the Great Church to better demonstrate how careful and well considered was the choice of verses that constituted the pericope, which a careless initiative tends to destroy: "Gospel according to John, chapter 188: 'At that time, the chief priests and elders of the people formed a council against Jesus, so that they might put him to death. And they came to Pilate saying, "away with him, away with him, crucify him,"'[54] and say up until, 'I do not find a crime in him,'[55] and pass over to chapter 192, and say again, 'And Pilate says to Jesus, "Where are you from?"'[56] and say until, 'unless it had been given to you from above,'[57] and pass over a little and say, 'then Pilate hearing this word,'[58] and say until, 'in Latin,'[59] and pass over to chapter 202, 'but standing by the cross of Jesus,'[60] and say until, 'after this Jesus knowing that all was finished,' and pass over to chapter 204, 'and inclining his head he gave up his spirit,' finally, 'his testimony is true.'"[61]

54. John 19:6.
55. John 19:6.
56. John 19:9.
57. John 19:11.
58. John 19:13.
59. John 19:20.
60. John 19:25.
61. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 1:32–33. Several Scriptural verses are omitted in the citation by Phountoulēs. The full text from the Typikon is translated here to avoid confusion and follows the text as in Mateos.

506

When is it more correct for the exit[62] to take place of the icon of Christ the Bridegroom during the evening of Palm Sunday: during Vespers, during the canon of Compline, or during "Behold, the bridegroom comes..."[63] of Matins?

The older practice provided for the "exit" of the icon of the "The One who comes"[64] or "The Bridegroom"[65] during the aposticha of Vespers for Palm Sunday and, specifically, during the chanting of the first troparion, "From palms and branches...."[66] The icon of the feast was withdrawn from the proskynētarion at that time and the icon of the Bridegroom was placed on it, without a special procession as is usual nowadays. This appears to be more correct liturgically given that from the aposticha—more precisely from the entrance—of Vespers, the transition takes place from the subject of the feast of Palm Sunday to the festal theme of Great Monday and more generally Great Week. The oikonomos and hierarchical vicar of Skiathos of blessed memory, Geōrgios Rēgas, in his book, *Questions of the Typikon*, Athens 1954, pp. 73–76,[67] is also in favor of this practice. There, he justifies this position at great length while referring to parallels and to the significance of the troparion chanted at that time. Conversely, he considered the old custom likewise inappropriate, during which the replacement of the icon took place during the troparion, "O Judaea, receive your king...,"[68] namely, the seventh troparion of the ninth ode of the Triōdion by Saint Andreas of Crete, which is chanted in Compline.[69] Likewise, he considers unfortunate the connection of the exit of the icon with the troparion, "Behold the bridegroom comes..." of the beginning of Matins. Indeed, he is right because the subject of the troparion is one thing (the bridegroom of the parable of the ten virgins, Mat-

62. "Ἔξοδος."
63. "Ἰδοὺ ὁ νυμφίος ἔρχεται..."
64. "Ἐλκομένου."
65. "Νυμφίου."
66. "Ἐκ βαΐων καὶ κλάδων..."
67. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 73–76.
68. "Ὑπόδεξαι Ἰουδαία τὸν βασιλέα..."
69. Saint Andreas of Crete (ca. 660–ca. 740).

thew 25:1–13 and Luke 12:35–38) and the icon being carried out represents another (the "One who comes"[70] onto the passion, or the more western, "Behold the man"[71]). The connection is purely superficial; the suffering "Bridegroom" Christ of the Church and the bridegroom of the parable.

Nevertheless, the modern practice of the "exit" of the icon of the Bridegroom during "Behold the bridegroom comes..." has become almost completely prevalent and it would be futile for anyone to attempt the restoration of the older correct practice. It also has in its favor the fact that during the Vespers or Compline the smallest number of faithful are found in the temple, but all are found during the Matins. The "exit" of the icon has become a popular element of the service. The monasteries ought to maintain their old precise and solemn tradition, but conditions are different in the parish temples and the tendency for the display of certain sensational elements because of human weakness is both legitimate and imperative. Namely, this is a double-natured issue of time and manner, which is tied to the subject that is posed by the question. And in both cases, the parish practice differs in recent times from the ancient revered and austere tradition, which is nowadays maintained in the monasteries alone, albeit they have not been conquered by the modernistic tendencies, by a kind of sacred "populism."[72] Let the use of this profane[73] term be permitted for us in an area as sacred as divine worship. However, I have the impression that I am not exaggerating.

And the term "exit"[74] unknown in our tradition, secular and inappropriate to be used for the explanation of sacred rites, shows the element as novel and strange to our worship, which tends to occupy a dominant position in it, which it never had. The case of the "exit" of the icon of the Bridegroom is not the only one, but perhaps it

70. "ἐλκόμενον."
71. "Ecce homo." Phountoulês is contrasting two styles of iconography, one of which is a depiction of Christ strongly influenced by western art and models and characterized by the title, "Ecce homo" taken from the Vulgate translation of John 19:5.
72. "λαϊκισμοῦ."
73. "βεβήλου."
74. "ἔξοδος."

is the most painless of other incursions of popular piety into our modern Typika. However, the uncontrolled course, towards which these newly introduced pietistic sensational elements can deviate, is characteristic. The danger of the transformation of our solemn services into a kind of sacred theatre, which is reminiscent of the "mysteries" or "sacred dramas" of the Middle Ages,[75] I believe is obvious. We will not speak regarding the "exit" of the Crucified One[76] and the unnailing, leaving for another occasion the answer to the relevant questions that have been posed by many.[77] The problem is where the permissible or tolerable boundary will be drawn and how we will stay in it. The Bridegroom, from a normal size icon, which developed from the templon's twelve great feasts,[78] acquired larger dimensions, with a tendency to reach or even surpass the physical measurements of the human body. Truncated icons, a kind of two-dimensional statue, also already appeared. Instead of being placed on the proskynētarion, as before, they are exposed on platforms in the center of the temple. Three-branched and multi-branched candelabra with double-headed eagles and mourning ribbons are lit, clouds of incense are emitted from adjacent censers, and piles of flowers surround the icon. The "exit" has come to be converted into a pompous procession with the participation of dozens of priests, deacons, and candle bearers, with the temple's lights out and whatever other sensational element the arbitrary pious opinion of those agents responsible for our worship dictate. There is no guarantee that this "exit" cannot also expand to other similar feasts (already it is also done with the icon of the mystical supper): the Nativity, Theophany, the Dormition of the Theotokos; why not also with icons

75. For a discussion of such dramas in Byzantium, see Andrew Walker White, *Performing Orthodox Ritual in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

76. "The Crucified One" (ὁ ἐσταυρωμένος) refers to an icon carved out in the form of the crucified body of the Lord, which is separate and normally attached to a large processional cross.

77. Although Phountoulēs has answered questions on this subject, see questions 27 and 358.

78. The term "τὸ δωδεκάορτο" refers to icons that represent the twelve great feasts that are displayed on the iconostasis (templon).

of saints being celebrated, if it pleases the people or is assumed that it cultivates their piety.

And for us to stay on the icon of the Bridegroom. It became prevalent for its "exit" to be done; indeed, to be done during "Behold the bridegroom comes..."; and to be placed in the middle of the temple. Let moderation and seriousness be observed, indeed in a place[79] that taught moderation and decency and never envied the glory of the "golden-dressed Persians."[80] Good models worthy of imitation are fortunately not lacking. The cathedral temple of Athens provided one this year with the modest folding stand, the icon of the Bridegroom of traditional dimensions, and the single candle, which burned beside it. A most worthy Hellenic sense of moderation and unpretentious modesty, according to the tradition and spirit of the Orthodox Church.

507

What is more correct, for us to chant a special apolytikion for every saint or for us to be content with the common ones, which are contained in the old Hōrologia and Mēnaia?

Indeed, the older printed editions of the Hōrologia and Mēnaia have fewer apolytikia and repeat, for many saints, the standard apolytikia for all with a change only of the name or even without mention of the saint's name. Thus, "O holy Apostle...,"[81] is used for almost all the apostles or evangelists, "O victorious Saint...,"[82] or "Your martyr, O Lord..."[83] or "Your martyrs, O Lord..."[84] for a martyr or

79. Greece.

80. The phrase, "χρυσοφόρων Μήδων," comes from an ancient epigram referring to the Battle of Marathon (490 BC) quoted by the orator Lycurgus before an Athenian audience c. 330 BC, "Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν," (In defense of the Hellenes, the Athenians at Marathon laid low the power of the golden-dressed Persians). See the translation and discussion in D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 225–231.

81. "Ἀπόστολε ἅγιε..."

82. "Ἀθλοφόρε ἅγιε..."

83. "Ὁ μάρτυς σου, Κύριε..."

84. "Οἱ μάρτυρές σου, Κύριε..."

martyrs, "God of our fathers..."[85] for hierarchs or blessed ones, "A rule of faith..."[86] for hierarchs, "When becoming a partaker of the Apostles' ways..."[87] for hieromartyr bishops, "With rivers of your tears..."[88] or "You showed yourself a citizen of the desert..."[89] or "In you, O Father [or Mother], was exactly preserved..."[90] for blessed ones, and the like. An even greater inflexibility is observed in manuscripts and older printed editions. In these, the apolytikia are fewer and the use of common ones more usual.

Certainty, the increase of the number of apolytikia, which is observed in modern printed editions up until the point each saint has his or her own troparion and "is not fitted out with the equipment of another,"[91] according to the expression of the printed edition of an older service for a local saint, Saint Ignatios of Mithymna, undoubtedly constitutes progress and an enrichment of traditional services, since in this way gaps and omissions of the old hymnography are filled.

In any case, it would be important for us to understand the reason for which the old liturgical books, while they have full or nearly full festal services for certain saints, do not have particular apolytikia for all of them. This cannot be random and unplanned, since it would not be difficult for the hymnographer who composed more than thirty troparia for each saint, to also write one more and certainly the most important and handy one, the apolytikion. But even in the later period, when supplementary services are composed by hymnographers, the old common apolytikion for the most part remains and a new one is not written. Thus, for example, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429), while he writes special services for nearly all the apostles, drawing from the New Testament whatever refers to them or making use of phrases from their epistles or their gospels for the evangelists, does not compose new apolytikia, but leaves the

85. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν..."
86. "Κανόνα πίστεως..."
87. "Καὶ τρόπων μέτοχος..."
88. "Ταῖς τῶν δακρύων σου ῥοαῖς..."
89. "Τῆς ἐρήμου πολίτης..."
90. "Ἐν σοί, πάτερ [ἢ μῆτερ] ἀκριβῶς..."
91. "μὴ κατακοσμεῖται στολαῖς ἀλλοτρίαις."

common and old ones. Namely, while he refreshes the service, with an apparent aim of the avoidance of trite expressions of the old apostolic canons, stichēra, and remaining troparia, he does not touch the universally common apolytikion. Most customarily in special services, which do not exist in the Mēnaia and are composed for covering the liturgical needs for the local honoring of various saints and which we find in old manuscripts, the same strange system at first glance is followed. A new festal service is composed, which can include forty to one hundred troparia, but the composition of a special apolytikion is avoided. Exceptions also certainly exist even in independent services in manuscript Typika and in modern printed editions that we also mentioned. However, the rule remains. And this cannot be done without a reason. This reason cannot be other than the particular liturgical aim that this type of troparion serves.

Indeed, the apolytikion is a troparion with a special purpose. It is "the troparion," the troparion par excellence, of the feast or of the saint, which is used in all the services and outside of the services, from or without the liturgical book, by the clergy and the people in every circumstance inside or outside the temple. Its naming, according to a possible account, is owed to the "short"[92] melody with which it is chanted, namely, in the simple and unpretentious, the unsophisticated and brief manner of its chanting. This etymology may not be correct (the prevailing one is that it was so named because it was originally considered a stichēron of "Now let your servant depart…"[93]), but the fact is that its melody is "short"/simple and its content plain and easy to remember, with of course exceptions. Obviously, the older apolytikia are certainly very brief, such as "O holy Apostle…" or "O victorious Saint…," a kind of simple and unpretentious invocation for the intercessions of the saint. There certainly also exist more difficult apolytikia, such as "In you, O Father [or

92. "ἀπολελυμένο." For the translation of "short," see Savas J. Savas, *Hymnology of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977), 6. "Ἀπολελυμένο" is the neuter nominative middle passive perfect participle of the verb, ἀπολύω. Phountoulēs is presenting the argument advanced by some that the name of this type of troparion (ἀπολυτίκιον) might be linked in this manner to its use signified by this participle.

93. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις…"

Mother], was exactly preserved…" or "With rivers of your tears…." However, their frequent repetition facilitates memorization, just as also the simple melody, their chanting in common.

This was the obvious aim of the Church when it deliberately kept the number of apolytikia reserved and used one apolytikion for many saints. It was not an example of poverty and hymnological sterility, but a fruit of wisdom and foresight. The wealth of troparia, stichēra, aposticha, doxastika, kathismata, canons, kontakia, and exaposteilaria, which presupposed a use of books, knowledge, and artistic chanting, was harnessed in the brief composition of an apolytikion, the "troparion" par excellence, for the handy use by heart of many persons inside and outside of the temple. With their proliferation, the whole body of the Church is in danger of not knowing and not being able to chant together even the simple and elementary apolytikia, which were known by all and handy for the reasons that we said before.

508

Does "And that we may be deemed worthy…"[94] or does only, "Wisdom, arise…,"[95] precede the gospel reading of the Presanctified for the first three days of Great Week?

The modern practice leans in favor of "Wisdom, arise…" alone, without "And that we may be deemed worthy," but there did not exist a consensus either formerly or now. The old-time priests applied a practical rule handed down orally from elders, according to which, "Wisdom, arise…" is said when an epistle precedes the gospel reading, but when an epistle is not read, "And that we may be deemed worthy…" must then be said. Based on this guidance, during the gospel readings for the Presanctifieds of Great Week, where the readings are the only ones without an epistle in a Liturgy, they said "And that we may be deemed worthy…." Of the modern printed Typika, the Typikon of Kōnstantinos simply notes: "'Let my prayer be set forth…,'[96] the gospel reading, and in succession the

94. "Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ἡμᾶς…"
95. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί…"
96. "Κατευθυνθήτω…"

Divine Liturgy."[97] The relevant rubric of the Triōdion is even more simple and vague: "'Let my prayer be set forth' and in succession the Divine Liturgy." Conversely, the Typikon of Violakēs is clear. In the rubric concerning Great Monday, it reads: "'Let my prayer be set forth' and immediately after this, 'Wisdom, arise let us hear…' and the gospel reading is said."[98] Thus, while the older printed editions leave the question vague such as in the Triōdion, the newer ones, obviously influenced by the Typikon of Violakēs, prescribe, "Wisdom, arise…" alone.

The older practice was variable. This is certainly not concluded from the vague rubrics of the majority of old Typika, but from clear witnesses that exist in some of them, from which it appears that there existed a dual tradition. Of the three most ancient and highly reliable Typika that survive, where the three are also traced back to the twelfth century, only two have "Wisdom, arise…" and one, "And that we may be deemed worthy…." We cite the relevant standard rubrics: "'Let my prayer be set forth' and immediately 'Wisdom, arise let us hear the holy gospel.' The deacon: 'The reading is from Gospel according to Matthew…'[99] and he reads the gospel" (Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis).[100] "'Let my prayer be set forth' and immediately the deacon, 'Wisdom, arise…'" (Typikon of the Savior of Messina).[101] But even, "The deacon, the synaptē of the gospel, and the archdeacon reads the gospel," unambiguously on Great Tuesday, "Immediately the deacon says, 'And that we may be deemed worthy…' and the patriarch, the gospel reading" (Typikon

97. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 234.

98. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 356.

99. "Ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον…"

100. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 464–465.

101. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 231.

of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem).[102] We also again confirm the same dual practice in modern manuscript Typika. Thus, for example, the Typikon of the *Codex Panteleēmonos 435* of the sixteenth century notes: "If there is only a gospel reading, such as during the three days of Great Week, again while 'Let my prayer be set forth' is chanted, the deacon asks for the prayer, and when the latter is completed ['Let my prayer be set forth' of course] he goes out and says the gospel." The ambiguity of the rubric is apparent, but from what the Typikon previously records regarding the reading of the gospel during the commemorations of saints during Lent, it appears to imply that as there so here "Wisdom, arise..." alone precedes the gospel reading. Another manuscript Typikon of the previous century, which is written by the Hagioritic hieromonk Methodios, represents the other tradition with an explicit reference to the practical oral rubric, regarding which we previously made mention: "In the Presanctified, it has only a gospel reading (which begins 'That we may deemed worthy' when it does not have a epistle reading) after 'Let my prayer be set forth,' but not also an epistle reading."[103]

The determination that we ended up with concerning an existence of two traditions, which are attested to already from the twelfth century up until nowadays, does not permit us to be unqualified in our choice, nor for us to characterize the one correct and the other mistaken. The most correct thing is for one to recommend the observance of local tradition. However, it would be interesting for us to attempt to understand the reason for the variation as to

102. Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898), 2:46, 63.

103. Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 352. Methodios (1841–1917 or 1920), a hieromonk of Mount Athos, was born in Aydin (Τράλλεις/Ἡλιούπολις, Asia Minor), was tonsured a monk in 1862 at the Monastery of Simōnos Petras on the Holy Mountain, served as the Secretary for the Sacred Community, resided in the kalyvē of the Transfiguration in the Skete of Kavsokalyvia, lived in a hermitage located in the area of Kerasia, and eventually spent his remaining life in the cave of Saint Athanasios (d. ca. 1003) near the Monastery of the Great Lavra. He was also active in the composition of hymnography. His work on the Typikon was produced in 1890.

the manner of introducing the gospel reading, sometimes only with "Wisdom, arise..." and at other times additionally with the diaconal command, "That we may be deemed worthy...."

First, the observation is completely precise that when an epistle reading precedes, only "Wisdom, arise..." is said. This form of dual readings, epistle/gospel, is encountered to begin with in the Divine Liturgy, in services that were formerly associated with it (baptism, marriage, unction, funeral, monastic tonsure, and so forth), but even in other instances (Hagiasmoi, Great Hours).

Consequently, the argument is not strong that in the first three days of Great Week, "And that we may be deemed worthy..." is not said since this is not a case of a Liturgy. Neither is the argument valid that because the "Let my prayer be set forth"/prokeimenon precedes, then "And that we may be deemed worthy..." is irrelevant. And in the festal Matins, a prokeimenon precedes the gospel reading, also in fact twice, and yet "And that we may be deemed worthy..." is said. I believe that it is obvious that the lack of an epistle reading caused this dual introductory exhortation ("And that..." "Wisdom, arise...") in these instances. The entire system (prokeimenon of the epistle reading – epistle reading – allēlouarion) prepares for the hearing of the gospel reading and is the customary introductory form in all cases of reading a gospel pericope (except for the Great Hours, which do not have an allēlouarion). In other instances, the reading of the gospel is inserted in some manner without preparation. The double notification of the reading has an obvious practical utility regarding the arousing of the people's attention. And another thing, as a simple hypothesis this time: The diaconal command, "And that we may be deemed worthy...," as it is formulated, when interpreted strictly, presupposes that the one who says it—the deacon— is hearing and not the same one who is reading the pericope of the gospel. Indeed, these gospel readings, prior to the reading of which that "And that we may be deemed worthy..." is provided (for Sunday and festal Matins, holy passions, Vespers of Pascha, Resurrection, ancient processions), are not read by the deacon, but by the priest or the bishop. In these instances, the deacon interjects, in some manner as a master of ceremonies, to announce the gospel reading and to arouse the

attention of the people present. The gospel readings of the Presanctified of Great Week are nowadays read by the deacon. However, according to the ancient taxis, the hierarch or the priest probably read them. According to the Typikon of the Resurrection,[104] which we saw, the patriarch himself at least read the gospel reading of Great Wednesday. According to other equally ancient Typika, as we likewise saw, the reading of these gospels was done by the deacon. There I think the difference lies, which had as implying the prefixing or not prefixing of "And that we may be deemed worthy..." in an era where relative flexibility still existed in the Typika. And even further: The difference establishes where these gospel readings belonged, in Vespers, therefore the priest would read them according to the taxis and the diaconal "And that..." would precede, or in the Liturgy, therefore the deacon would read them without "And that...." Historically, the former is probably justified.

509

During the weekdays of Great Lent, "Alleluia" is chanted with four verses. Would it be preferable for the last two verses to be replaced with others more suitable so that adverse comments are not caused?

The triple "Alleluia," which is chanted four times after the Six Psalms and the great synaptē during the weekday Matins of Great Lent and during the first five days of Great Week constitute the ephymnion for the ode of the prophet Isaiah (chapter 26:9–20). Four verses (verses 9a, 9b, 11b, and 15), which precede the chanting of the "Alleluia," are nowadays selected from the ode. Originally, it appears that all or nearly all the verses of the ode were chanted, as also happened with the prokeimena and the allēlouaria. The chanting of the ode of Isaiah during the evening or morning service must be a very old custom, since it is already attested to by Basileios the Great ("For among us, the people arise early at night to go to the house of prayer...," *Letter 207*)[105] and by the sacred Chrysostomos ("Then, immediately

104. The Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem.

105. Translation from Roy J. Deferrari, trans., *Saint Basil: The Letters* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), 3:186–187

rising [the monks] stand while singing prophetic hymns with much harmony and rhythmical melodies...And these songs are fitting and full of affectionate regard towards God...and again, 'In the night my spirit eagerly seeks you, O God, because your ordinances are a light upon the earth,'[106]" *Sermon 14 on 1 Timothy*).[107] This was done, as it appears from the witnesses above, both in the parish and monastic service in a period where the system of nine biblical odes (in which the ode of Isaiah has the fifth place) had not yet developed.

The repetition of the chanting of the ode, which was in this manner caused, and the reordering and abridgment of other older elements, which was chiefly due to the introduction of the canon, had as a result the restriction of the verses to four selected ones. Chosen as such were its verse, "In the night my spirit eagerly seeks you...," a verse apropos and wondrous in content that also resulted in the selection of the ode of Isaiah at the beginning of the service, the second "Learn righteousness...,"[108] and the two others to which the question also refers (11b "Jealously will take hold..."[109] and 15 "Increase evils on them, O Lord..."[110]). If these were taken literally, as often happened with Christians who hear them chiefly during the services of Great Week, the faithful not only acquire "no edification from the things being said by them for the acquisition of meekness," but conversely a "hard disposition contrary to evangelical teaching... from often praying against [namely, calling down curses upon] enemies and not loving," in order for us to use, to avoid any misunderstanding, the very words of Athanasios the Great (*Introduction to the Psalms*).[111] Eusebios of Caesarea interprets the third verse as referring to those "of circumcision," namely to the Jews, who did not accept the "grace through Christ" and for this reason will be given over "to fire and darkness," "which is prepared for the devil and his angels"[112]

106. "Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ Θεός, διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματά σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς."
107. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Sermon 14 on 1 Timothy* 3 (PG 62:574).
108. "Δίκαιοσύνην μάθετε..."
109. "Ζῆλος λήψεται..."
110. "Πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακά, Κύριε..."
111. PG 27:60a.
112. Matthew 25:41.

(*Commentaries on Isaiah*, chapter 26).[113] He also gives an analogous interpretation on the fourth verse. And within the scope of the "universal judgment" of God over the sinful world, which is also diffuse in the Six Psalms, the reason for the selection of these two verses is understandable. In any case, the two commentator Fathers insist on the need for a spiritual explanation of these verses and other comparable ones that exist in the Psalter.

The curses and the vengeful disposition against enemies, suitable to the spirit of the Old Testament, unsuitable to the people of grace, are interpreted as referring to the ungodly satanic powers, which are opposed to God's will and to the salvation of humanity. We quote the entire section from the *Introduction to the Psalms* of Athanasios the Great, where the relevant problem and its solution are set forth in a marvelous manner: "David who is a prophet, and has his interior eyes opened, and knows that evil spirits rejoice at the fall of humanity and grieve in turn when defeated over the setting aright of humanity, thus created prayers against them in an altogether noetic manner, when changing them from enemies perceived by the senses to these. For if we do not understand the aim of the prophets in this manner, not only will we possess no edification from the things being said by them for the acquisition of meekness, but we will assume a hard disposition contrary to evangelical teaching from often praying against enemies and not loving, when countless times David says, 'May all my enemies be put to shame and feel humiliated and may I not be put to shame.'[114] We should not be persuaded that men who are prophets and friends of God thus say these things except in the aforementioned way. It is necessary for the learned one to have this in mind, if he might find a prophet uttering curses there, changing enemies perceived by the senses to noetic ones."[115]

In any case, it would be interesting and useful theoretically and practically for one to look back to tradition in order see whether the selection of the four verses that became prevalent is the only one attested to or if perhaps other better selections also existed, which

113. PG 24:273a–273b.
114. Compare Psalm 34:4 and 69:3.
115. PG 24:60a–60b.

after the prevalence of the printed editions, were set aside. It is well known, and we also on another occasion referred to this, that the printed editions of the first liturgical books were based on certain manuscripts accessible to the first publishers, which did not always reflect the tradition commonly prevailing, nor even the more preferred practice in the event of a discrepancy. However, they created a new tradition, which thereafter was repeated in new printed editions. Its prevalence for nearly five hundred years from that time became a cause for the mistaken impression to be formed that this taxis is also the more correct one. In any event, its revision nowadays is difficult, perhaps indeed also not desirable, for reasons of preservation of the taxis in divine worship, which is without doubt more preferable to the disorder that would be caused if the correction is not done by the official central ecclesiastical authority after serious study and sober critical analysis.

In the case in question, the retrospection into the older practice, which is indicatively represented by certain old and trustworthy manuscripts, anything but confirms the correctness of the choice that became prevalent with the printed editions. Here is the image that a first sampling study, by necessity impromptu, gives us:

To begin with, the first verse of the ode ("In the night my spirit eagerly seeks you, O God, because your ordinances are a light upon the earth,"[116] Isaiah 26:9a) is generally preferred and is placed as a first verse for the chanting of "Alleluia."

As a second verse, the second verse of the ode ("Learn righteousness you who dwell on the earth,"[117] Isaiah 26:9b) is usually chosen, but in other manuscripts extends up until also verse 10a ("for the impious one has come to an end; he will not learn righteousness on the earth, he will not perform truth")[118] or is only confined to the end of verse 10a: "On the earth he will not perform truth,"[119] or only

116. "Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ Θεός, διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματά σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

117. "Δίκαιοσύνην μάθετε, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς."

118. "πέπαυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσεβής· πᾶς οὐ μὴ μάθῃ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀλήθειαν οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ." The text in the answer reads "πᾶς, ὃς οὐ…." However, this variation is not in the standard critical editions of the text.

119. "Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀλήθειαν οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ."

to 10b, "Let the impious one be taken away so that he will not see the glory of the Lord."[120]

The end of verse 11 is elsewhere provided as a third verse: "And fire will now consume the adversaries,"[121] and in other manuscripts, verse 15, as also in the printed editions, "Increase evils on them, O Lord, increase evils on the glorious ones of the earth."[122]

Finally, verse 17b of the ode is chosen as a fourth verse, "She cried out in her pangs, so were we to your beloved"[123] or only the end of the same verse, "So were we to your beloved."[124]

All these things show that after the prevalence of the selective chanting of the four verses of the ode, a dual path was followed for the selection of the verses. Namely, that after the first verse either they continued the stichologia to the beginning verses of the ode (in any case with different cuts in the dividing of verses according to different traditions at the time) or took selected verses from the whole ode.

In a potential serious attempt for a revision, as the retrospection into the tradition teaches us, the selection of the verses of those manuscripts which by chance became prevalent through the printed editions could be judged as nonbinding. Instead of the two verses problematic for interpretation, which when literally interpreted and heard cause reasonable misunderstandings, it would be possible for other verses to be chosen from the same requisite ode. For example, such wondrous verses are the twelfth ("O Lord our God, give us peace for you have granted us all things"),[125] the thirteenth ("O Lord, our God, take possession of us; O Lord, we know no other besides you; we name your name"),[126] the sixteenth ("O Lord, in affliction I remembered you; with small affliction your chastening was

120. "Ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου."
121. "Καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται."
122. "Πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακά, Κύριε, πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακὰ τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῆς γῆς."
123. "Ἐπὶ τῇ ὀδύνῃ αὐτῆς ἐκέκραζεν, οὕτως ἐγενήθημεν τῷ ἀγαπητῷ σου."
124. "Οὕτως ἐγενήθημεν τῷ ἀγαπητῷ σου."
125. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, εἰρήνην δὸς ἡμῖν, πάντα γὰρ ἀπέδωκας ἡμῖν."
126. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, ἐκτός σου ἄλλον οὐκ οἴδαμεν, τὸ ὄνομά σου ὀνομάζομεν."

on us"),[127] the eighteenth ("Because of fear of you, O Lord, we conceived and travailed and gave birth; a spirit of salvation, which we produced upon the earth")[128] or finally, the nineteenth ("The dead shall arise and those who are in the tombs shall be raised and those who are in the earth shall rejoice").[129] Before so many possibilities of choice, is it justified for the practice to remain bound by the two verses that "pray against" enemies, perceived or noetic: "Jealousy will take hold of an uninstructed people, and fire will now consume the adversaries"[130] (the Jews, according to Eusebios) or "Increase evils on them, O Lord, increase evils on the glorious ones of the earth"[131]?

510

Is the "Alleluia" a joyful or penitential hymn? If it is joyful, why is it chanted during Great Lent instead of "God is the Lord and has appeared to us..."[132]?

"Alleluia" is a doxological exclamation, a word/phrase, which in Hebrew means "Praise God" or "Praise the Lord" (*allelu*, "praise" and *ja* or *jah*, the abbreviated form of the unspoken name of God [*Jahwe*]). From the psalms, where it is encountered twenty-two times as a refrain (Psalm 104 and following) and from its use in Jewish temple and synagogue worship, it passed to the New Testament and to the liturgical practice of the universal Church. In the Revelation of John, we encounter it four times, all with a doxological meaning and all within a most obvious liturgical context (Revelation 19:1, 3, 4, 6: "After these things I heard what seemed to be a mighty voice of a great multitude in heaven saying 'Alleluia; the salvation and the glory and the power of our God'...And a second time they said, 'Al-

127. "Κύριε, ἐν θλίψει ἐμνήσθην σου, ἐν θλίψει μικρᾷ ἡ παιδεία σου ἡμῖν."

128. "Διὰ τὸν φόβον σου, Κύριε, ἐν γαστρὶ ἐλάβομεν καὶ ὠδινήσαμεν καὶ ἐτέκομεν· πνεῦμα σωτηρίας, ὃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς." "Διὰ τὸν φόβον σου, Κύριε" ("Because of fear of you, O Lord") appears to be the last part of verse 17. The translation from NETS is modified to match the Greek text quoted.

129. "Ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται οἱ ἐν τῇ γῇ."

130. "Ζῆλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἕδεται."

131. "Πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακά, Κύριε, πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακὰ τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῆς γῆς."

132. "Θεὸς Κύριος καὶ ἐπέφανεν ἡμῖν..."

leluia'...and worshipped God who is seated upon the throne saying, 'Amen. Alleluia'...And I heard what seemed to be the voice of a great multitude, like the sound of many waters and like the sound of mighty thunderpeals, saying, 'Alleluia, that the Lord God almighty reigned, let us rejoice and exult and give him glory'...). Indeed, in verse five of the same chapter of Revelation, there exists along with the Hebrew word, "Alleluia," also its rendering and elaboration into Greek: "'Allēlouia' And a voice came out of the throne saying: 'Praise our God all you his servants and who fear him, small and great.'"[133]

Consistent with its grammatical meaning and according to biblical precedence, "Alleluia" was widely used in Christian worship as a doxological exclamation, as a type of joyful shout or cheer or as an exhortation for praise of God, chiefly as an ephymnion for biblical psalmic verses, prokeimena, allēlouaria, koinōnika, antiphons, psalms, and even Christian poetical compositions. Indeed, in the parish "asmatic" Typikon, thirty-one of the sixty-two antiphons, into which the Psalter was divided, had "Alleluia" according to verse as an ephymnion/hypakoē. In the liturgical practice of the Western Church, "Alleluia" is the resurrectional chant par excellence, like almost "Christ is risen..." in our own tradition. We encounter an analogous use of "Alleluia" in two idiomela of the fourth tone, which are chanted in the Litē for the commemoration of Saint Geōrgios (April 23), which are works of Anatolios the hymnographer.[134] The first is resurrectional, and in the second the encomium for the saint is combined with the resurrectional period, during which his commemoration falls: "Clap your hands, all nations; let us shout in jubilation to God our savior...and together with himself he raised the dead who cry to him: Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, to Christ, who

133. This also quotes the last word of Rev 19:4.

134. Hans Georg-Beck cites the opinion of W. Christ that the hymnographer Anatolios should be dated to the time of Iōannēs of Damascus, but not before the seventh century. For this discussion, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 472.

is risen," and "Crown of glory...Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, to Christ, who is risen."[135]

The character of "Alleluia" as, in some manner, a victory cheer presupposes, naturally, the war against satanic ungodly powers and its positive outcome; namely, it is connected with God's judgment over the sinful world. Thus, the rabbinic hermeneutical tradition justifies the use of "Alleluia" as an ephymnion only from Psalm 104 onwards; it is assumed that up until then the victory of God against his enemies and his people's enemies has not yet been achieved. The doxology for the victory against enemies is indeed the subject of many psalms to which "Alleluia" is prefixed, such as 104, 105, 106, 109, 113, 117, 134, and 135, but it is also used elsewhere in the Old Testament (3 Maccabees 7:13, Tobit 13:18), even in chapter nineteen of Revelation. We saw that the meaning of God's judgment also underlies the choice of the verses from the ode of Isaiah during the chanting of "Alleluia" at the beginning of Matins. It is obvious that the most ancient trinitarian troparia, which at that time accompany "Alleluia," were written specifically for being used at this particular point of the service and for this reason have special worth as in some way interpretive commentaries on the chanting of "Alleluia."[136] Their central theme is the invitation for glorification of the trinitarian God. The triple "Alleluia" is connected with the triple "Holy" of the prophet Isaiah (chapter 6:3), who is also the composer of the ode which is recited with stichologia during its chanting (Isaiah 26:9–20). God's judgment over the world is either directly expressed in these troparia (for example, "The judge will suddenly come...)[137] or indirectly indicated with the emphasis on God's attribute as an

135. Translation modified from Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The April Menaion* (Boston, MA: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 2005), 99.

136. This set of triadika found in the Hōrologion must not be confused with the triadika canons chanted during the Midnight Office on Sundays, which are found in the Paraklētikē for each tone.

137. "Ἀθρόον ὁ κριτὴς ἐπελεύσεται..." (third tone). The full text of the troparion is: "Ἀθρόον ὁ Κριτὴς ἐπελεύσεται, καὶ ἑκάστου αἱ πράξεις γυμνωθήσονται· ἀλλὰ φόβῳ κράξωμεν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῆς νυκτός· Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεός, διὰ τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς."

impartial judge and the underlining of the unworthiness of human melodists.

From what we wrote above, it has already become apparent that it was easy for the extraordinarily festive and doxological exclamation of "Alleluia" to slip towards other secondary meanings if the interpretation shifted focus, for reasons of spiritual edification, towards the implications of the glorification of God and towards its presuppositions. The distance between glorification and compunction is great, but not also unbridgeable.

Thus, while the doxological character of the chanting of "Alleluia" is emphasized by older commentators consistent with the grammatical meaning, the implicit meaning of the coming and judgment of God is underlined by later ones. Of the former we are referring to Athanasios the Great, Eusebios of Caesarea, and Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite.[138] "'Alleluia' is praise to the invisible one,"[139] "for *allelu*[140] is translated 'praise,' and the *ja*,[141] 'the Lord'"[142] (Athanasios of Alexandria, *On Psalms 104 and 134*).[143] "'Alleluia' means praise of the Lord, for the word is translated in this manner,"[144] "'Alleluia' is a mystical exhortation that urges those who hear, the singing of hymns to God, so that its meaning is precisely this, 'Praise the Lord.' For parts of holy Scripture in which this expression that means, 'Praise the Lord,' is added, such is signified in Hebrew by 'Alleluia.'

138. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite was a sixth century author who falsely represented his writings as those of the hieromartyr Saint Dionysios, who is mentioned in Acts 17:34 and commemorated on October 3. Pseudo-Dionysios's theological views were heavily influenced by Neoplatonism and exercised a wide influence on liturgical writings (Alexander Kazhdan and Barry Baldwin, "Dionysios the Areopagite, Pseudo-," *ODB* 2:629–630).

139. PG 27:441c.

140. "ἀλληλοὺ."

141. "Ἰα."

142. PG 27:525a.

143. On this work, see Giovanni Maria Vian, *Testi Inediti dal Commento al Salmi di Atanasio*, Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 14 (Roma: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1978) and G. C. Stead, "St. Athanasius on the Psalms," *Vigilae Christianae* 39 (1985): 65–78.

144. PG 24:61c.

While *allelu*[145] means the praise that has reference to God, *ja*[146] is one of those names expressive of the divine nature. United together, *Alleluia* is translated 'Praise of God.'"[147] (Eusebios of Caesarea, *On Psalms 145 and 104*).[148] "Those who know Hebrew translate the sacred song of inspiration[149] for the prophets chosen by God: 'Praise of God' or 'Praise the Lord'" (Pseudo-Dionysios, *Concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 4.3.12).[150]

In addition, the most ancient custom of its chanting as a prokeimenon of the gospel reading obviously contributed to the emphasis of the meaning of "Alleluia" as signifying God's coming and judgment. With the reading of the gospel, present within the synaxis is Christ himself, who preaches the gospel, teaches, acts, suffers, is resurrected, in other words, acts for the salvation of the world. "Alleluia" as a prefix for the gospel reading is "laudatory"[151] of the coming of Christ. The inexact knowledge of its grammatical meaning due to ignorance of the Hebrew language also contributed to promoting this interpretation. According to Pseudo-Sōphronios of Jerusalem, "Allēlouia" is thus translated: "*al*, 'he appeared,' *ēl*, 'God,' and *ouia*, 'praise the living God'" (*Oration containing all ecclesiastical history*, 18).[152] Germanos of Constantinople is more detailed: "David cries

145. "ἀλληλού."

146. "ἴα."

147. PG 23:1295c.

148. On this work, see Michael J. Hollerich, "Eusebius' *Commentary on the Psalms* and Its Place in the Origins of Christian Biblical Scholarship," in *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, ed. Aaron Johnson and Jeremy Schott, Hellenic Studies Series 60 (Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013), 262–291.

149. Namely, alleluia.

150. PG 3:485a–485b.

151. The word "μυνητικόν" in the text was taken to be a misspelling of the word "ὑμνητικόν."

152. PG 87:3997c. According to René Bornert, the liturgical commentary falsely attributed to Sōphronios (possibly Saint Sōphronios of Jerusalem, r. 633–638), most likely dates to the twelfth century, but not later than the thirteenth or earlier than the eleventh. Although variously titled, the manuscript contained in *Vaticanus Ottobonianus 459* was the basis for its publication in Migne and was entitled, *Λόγος περιέχων τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἅπασαν ἱστορίαν καὶ λεπτομερῆ ἀφήγησιν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἱερουργίᾳ τελουμένων* (*Oration containing all ecclesiastical history and a detailed narration of all performed in the Divine*

aloud 'Allēlouia' and says: 'Our God shall manifestly come and fire shall go before him....'[153] For in the Hebrew language, *al* is 'he comes/appeared,' *ēl*, 'God,' *ouia*, 'praise and sing hymns to the living God.' In a different way, *al* is 'the Father,' *ēl* is 'the Son,' *ouia* is 'the Holy Spirit.' 'Allēlouia' is 'God mighty, strong, praise of God, praise the living God.' In a different way: 'Allēlouia' is 'praise to the living God.' In a different way: 'Allēlouia' signifies divine praise in a threefold manner for the one divinity of the three Persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In a different way: 'Allēlouia' is a herald of the gospel crying aloud the Lord comes. In a different way: 'Allēlouia' is 'you praised, you hymned'" (*Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*).[154]

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who knew and selectively combined all the older interpretations, explains that the chanting of the "Alleluia" before the gospel reading means "praise of God and the advent of divine grace, which is the reading of the gospel" (*Explanation of the Divine Temple*, 66).[155] In his *Dialogue*, he gives us a most beautiful commentary on "the often sung...song, 'Alleluia,'"[156] and on its liturgical use: "The prophets inspired by the Holy Spirit

---

Sacred-Service), PG 87:3981b–4001b. Phountoulēs most likely referenced this edition. For a discussion of the commentary, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 210–211.

153. Psalm 49:3, a paraphrase.

154. PG 98:412b–412c. Saint Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 715–730), is attributed authorship of a commentary on the Liturgy entitled, *Ἱστορία Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ Μυστικὴ Θεωρία* (*Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*), a work of synthesis, major influence, and importance. For a discussion of authorship and an important study, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 125–180. For its modern translation and an introduction, see Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984). For a detailed examination of the work's significance, see Robert Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–1981): 45–75.

155. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries*, vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011), 120–121.

156. PG 155:225b.

would sing this song, the 'Alleluia,' which indeed signifies the advent of God and 'God is coming, and praise Him,' which is regarded prophetically and sung on account of the Lord about to come both during His first as well as His second coming and always to dispatch His grace in us, in the Holy Spirit. For which reason also the Church always sings this song, while receiving Christ and receiving this from heaven" (chapter 63, compare chapters 111 and 347).[157]

In any case, in all these commentaries on "Alleluia," despite the emphasis of the divine coming, the festive and doxological character, namely, its original meaning, did not cease to be emphasized.

Categorical on this point is the sacred Nikolaos Kabasilas, who when comparing the trisagion before the epistle reading, (where "the hymn is mixed with supplications; for 'have mercy' is added") with the "Alleluia" prior to the gospel reading, notes that "we make the hymn pure from supplication in order for us to learn that Christ is signified by the Gospel, which, for those who find it, is everything at hand that is sought. And because the Bridegroom is within, there is also no need for them to supplicate concerning anything else, while having everything. Just as it is neither reasonable for the sons of the Bridegroom to fast as long as the Bridegroom is with them,[158] but this alone, to worship and hymn Him. Since also the hymn of the angels,[159] as the prophets taught it, is this very hymn alone, which is removed from all supplication" (*On the Divine Liturgy*, 22).[160]

---

157. PG 155:225c, 316b–316d, 629b.

158. Matthew 9:15.

159. Alleluia.

160. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 22.2 in *Nicholas Cabasilas: Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, eds. René Bornert, Jean Gouillard, and Pierre Périchon, and trans. Sévérien Salaville, 2nd edition, SC 4bis (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 154. Nikolaos Chamaetos Kabasilas (Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας) (b. ca. 1320–1324, d. after 1391) lived in Thessaloniki as a theologian. His writings on the Liturgy continue to exercise a major influence on Orthodox liturgical thought. The Sources Chrétiennes edition will be used for a text of his liturgical commentary, *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας* (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*). The paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work will be given consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those cited by Phountoulēs. For an English translation, see J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty, trans., *Nicholas Cabasilas, A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977). For an assessment of his work, see

How now from a joyous hymn, significative of God's coming and judgment, did "Alleluia" come to be considered a penitential or mournful hymn? It appears that liturgical reasons pushed the interpretation of "Alleluia" in this direction. Specifically, it is used in the service of Matins during "ferial"[161] or fasting days instead of "God is the Lord...," and in the service of Vespers as an ephymnion of the prokeimenon. Similarly, during funereal days,[162] it is chanted with special verses in the service of Matins instead of "God is the Lord...," also by imitation of them in funereal vigils (an extended form of memorial services)[163] as well as also during funeral services. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, when commenting on the use of "Alleluia" as an ephymnion of the amōmos[164] during the funeral service, writes: "[the Alleluia] which signifies 'the Lord is coming,' represents his second coming, in which when appearing He will raise up all of us who have died."[165] Similarly, its chanting prior to the funeral gospel reading, "as a sign of the advent of God and as a proclamation of Christ's coming and our resurrection from the dead through Him"[166] (*Dialogue*, chapter 366). However, in essence also in both these cases, this concerns the common practice, namely, of chanting "Alleluia" as an ephymnion of the "asmatic" antiphons and concerns the allēlouarion prior to the gospel reading. In these specific cases,

---

Ἀθανάσιος Ἀ. Ἀγγελόπουλος, *Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας, Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1970) and René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 215–244.

161. "λιτές." This is a weekday of the church calendar on which no feast falls.

162. Days on which funereal troparia are chanted in various services, such as Matins. This includes most Saturdays of the year. However, for Saturdays, modern Typika vary in prescribing whether the "Alleluia" or "God is the Lord..." is chanted depending on whether a feast or saint is celebrated. With a few exceptions, the Triōdion generally prescribes "Alleluia" to be chanted on all weekdays. For a study of when "Alleluia" and "God is the Lord..." is chanted consistent with parish liturgical practice in the Church of Greece, see Χαράλαμπος Θ. Δράκος, *Ὁ Ὄρθρος - Ἀναλυτικὸ Τυπικὸ ὅλων τῶν Ὀρθρων σὲ περίοδο Μηνιαίου* (Πρέβεζα: Χαράλαμπος Θ. Δράκος, 2003).

163. Such vigils for a deceased include the reading of psalms and, when involving deceased clergy, the gospels ("διάβασμα τοῦ τετραεὐαγγελίου").

164. Psalm 118.

165. PG 155:684a–684b.

166. PG 155:685a.

Symeōn, who accepts the interpretation, "the Lord is coming," gives to "Alleluia" a particular firm meaning.

Now, regarding the use of "Alleluia" in the Matins as an ephymnion of the ode of Isaiah instead of "God is the Lord..." and as an ephymnion of the prokeimena of "ferial"[167] days instead of the customary prokeimena of Vespers according to the day. Saint Markos Eugenikos correctly juxtaposes the chanting of "Alleluia" to "God is the Lord...." He considers "God is the Lord..." and its verses "visible symbols of the coming of the Lord made manifest in life at the end of times[168]...which as joyous are avoided during fasting days, we chant the Alleluia instead of them" (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*).[169] Saint Symeōn gives an analogous explanation regarding the chanting of "God is the Lord...": "And all the lights are lighted on account of 'The glory of the Lord shone around them.'[170] And 'God is the Lord' is melodiously loudly sung in imitation of the glorifying angels. And what is said is most fitting, 'God is the Lord and has appeared to us,' the Word of God having been made flesh. 'Blessed is he who comes,' himself as God through the flesh. 'In the name of the Lord,' of his Father and his own. And in this manner, if it is a feast, that of the feast is chanted, or if the commemoration of a saint, that of the saint, since nature was sanctified through the one made flesh..." (*Dialogue*, chapter 309).[171]

In other words, the emphasis is given not to the penitential character of the "Alleluia," but to the festiveness of "God is the Lord...." They gave a Christological meaning to "God is the Lord...," and its chanting provided the festal tone of the day at the beginning of Matins. It is very likely that it was originally sung only during feasts of the Lord and afterwards its chanting was gradually expanded also to the remaining feast days of the year, to feasts of the Mother of God, and to the commemorations of the saints being celebrated.[172]

---

167. "λιτῶν."

168. 1 Peter 1:20.

169. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*) (PG 160:1177c).

170. Luke 2:9.

171. PG 155:565d–568a.

172. In other words, saints celebrated with a Divine Liturgy.

Its chanting, which was accompanied with a lighting, was a real spiritual event for the community.[173] We quote the relevant rubric from the Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior of Messina from the year 1131, a truly marvelous text, which makes unnecessary any other commentary: "After the completion of this [the Six Psalms], on the most splendid days 'God is the Lord' is at once put into melody with the troparion proper to the day...and at once, on the most conspicuous and festal days, we clearly and gracefully cry out, 'God is the Lord and has appeared to us,' as if perceiving in reality divine illumination in some manner suddenly appearing and shining round us, and driving away as far as possible any cloud of gloom and sadness, and bestowing freely to us the marvelous and most clear sky of joy. Rejoicing over these things, and not being able to contain unexpressed in ourselves the magnitude of gladness, but out of pleasure loudly shouting, when making known the delight that mystically takes place and announcing the good news to one another as we are not neglectful while supplicating, nor neglectful in compunction while praying, but He heard us from his holy temple, when approaching those whose heart is contrite and when saving the humble in spirit, 'God is the Lord and appeared to us.' However, these things are done on feast days."[174]

Equally wonderful and revealing of the meaning of "Alleluia" is also its annotation for the manner of its chanting, which follows in the Typikon above: "In the remaining days, when 'God is the Lord' is not chanted, immediately after the Six Psalms first for us the trinitarian and triumphal hymn is sung in a clear voice with the 'Alleluia.' For the inspired Isaiah says that these most holy Seraphim also cry aloud, to one another this most sacred and often sung and most reverential praise, although the cry is intended for us in one way, and in another way for those most divine and blessed powers. Therefore, also suitably we loudly raise this thrice-holy voice; on the one hand,

173. On Mount Athos, it is a practice to light candles and lamps during the chanting of the ninth ode during Matins.

174. Miguel Arranz, *Le typicon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensis gr 115, A.D. 1131*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pointicium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 292.

this is by imitation of them, but on the other, this is out of excessive joy that with the heavenly powers we were deemed worthy both to stand and sing this most sacred melody with them."[175]

The Typikon of the blessed Nikōn of the Black Mountain (Antioch) is approximately half a century older than the Typikon of the Savior of Messina.[176] Nikōn confirms a disagreement among the Typika as to the number of days, during which "God is the Lord…" is chanted ("The feasts do not agree precisely…but often matters found in the one writing are not found in the other")[177] and a tendency for lessening the number of days of chanting the "Alle-

175. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 292–293.

176. Nikōn of the Black Mountain (Νίκων τοῦ ἐν τῷ Μαύρῳ Ὄρει) was born ca. 1025 in Constantinople, died in the early twelfth century, lived on the Black Mountain in Syria near Antioch, and was the author of liturgical, ascetical, and canonical works. These works included the *Taktikon* (*Τακτικόν*), which contained two monastic Typika. The Typika are edited in Christan Hannick, Peter Plank, Carolina Lutzka, Tat′jana I. Afanas′eva, and Irénée Doens, eds., *Das Taktikon des Nikon vom Schwarzen Berge : griechischer Text und kirchenslavische Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Verteris Fontes and Dissertationes, Tom. LXII (Freiburg: Weiher Verlag, 2014), 48–154; Владимир Бенешевич (Vladimir Beneševi ć), ed., Тактикон Никона Черногорца: Греческий текст по рукописи № 441 Синайского монастыря св. Екатерины Бенешевич В. (St. Petersburg, 1917), 22–80; cf. also Владимир Бенешевич (Vladimir Beneševi ć), ed., *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in monastero Sanctae Catharinae in Monte Sina asservantur* (St. Petersburg, 1911), 1:237–246. The English translation of both Typika from Beneševi ć appears in Thomas and Hero, 1:385–439. For further information, see Robert Allison's introduction to the English translation (Thomas and Hero, 1:377–383); Alexander Kazhdan, "Nikon of the Black Mountain," *ODB* 3:1484–1485; and Θεόδωρος Γιάγκου, *Νίκων ὁ Μαυροείτης: Βίος — Συγγραφικὸ Ἔργο — Κανονικὴ Διδασκαλία* (Θεσσαλονίκη: 1991).

177. "Οὐ συμφωνοῦσιν ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ αἱ ἑορταί…ἀλλὰ πολλάκις αἱ εὑρισκόμεναι εἰς τὸ ἓν σύγγραμμα εἰς τὸ ἕτερον οὐχ εὑρίσκονται," Jean Baptiste Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense Complectens Sanctorum Patrum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum Anecdota Hactenus Opera: Selecta E Graecis Orientalibusque Et Latinis Codicibus* (Paris: Prostat Apud Firmin Didot Fratres, Instituti Franciae Typographos, 1858), 4:452. Although not directly attributed to Nikōn by Pitra, Phountoulēs appears to cite the latter, which seems to be a variant of text paragraph numbers 91and 89 respectively published in Christan Hannick, *Das Taktikon des Nikon vom Schwarzen Berge*, 122–124 and Vladimir Beneševi ć, Тактикон Никона Черногорца, 61.

luia" in order for the days of not fasting to be correspondingly increased with a specious pretext. In the Typikon in question, the days during which "God is the Lord..." is chanted (namely, the festal days, during which in various ways the fast is broken) in the months where they do not fall in periods of fasting or non-fasting, half the month is the average rule: twenty for September, twelve for October, fifteen for January, ten for July, and so forth.[178] This tendency was not held back either with the intervention of Nikōn or other lovers of strictness and conservatism. Thus, while everywhere nearly the same allocation was applied as to the festal days where "God is the Lord..." was chanted and the "ferial"[179] days where "Alleluia" was chanted, gradually for various reasons "God is the Lord..." continually gained ground at the expense of "Alleluia" until also even in these monasteries—apart from a few exceptions—it[180] came to be relegated only to the weekdays of Great Lent. This leveling naturally damaged "God is the Lord..." and downgraded its original importance, since the days outside of Great Lent all became festal days to some extent, without truly being so.

The spread of "God is the Lord..." also had another repercussion less obvious at first glance. It became a cause of the complete misinterpretation of the meaning of "Alleluia," which was considered mourning, penitential, and appropriate only for the weekdays of the great fast, but which of themselves were penitential and mourning days. However, in Matins and in the prokeimena, the "Alleluia" was and continues to be the call for glorification of God for the common, the "ferial"[181] or "ordinary,"[182] days, without the Alleluia or the accompanying triadika having a penitential or mourning character.

---

178. Nikōn of the Black Mountain, *Taktikon* 91–94/89–92 respectively in Christan Hannick, *Das Taktikon des Nikon vom Schwarzen Berge,* 122–134 and Vladimir Benešević, Тактикон Никона Черногорца, 61–67; cf. Jean Baptiste Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense,* 4:452–455. See the translation in Thomas and Hero, 1:411–416. The Typikon referenced does not appear to contain the referenced numbers of days.

179. "λιτές."

180. "Alleluia."

181. "λιτές."

182. "ἄμνημες."

This misunderstanding regarding the meaning of "Alleluia" and the attribution of a penitential sense to it found its apex in the attempt to eliminate the allēlouaria during Renewal Week. In the report of the Great Church of Christ's review committee, which precedes the publication of the Typikon of the prōtopsaltēs, Geōrgios Violakēs (press of Michaēl Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. v), the following paradoxical issue is placed as fourth: "Whether the Alleluia ought to be omitted after the reading of the pericope from the Acts of the Apostles during Renewal Week, as was accustomed for some years, although the rubric in the Pentēkostarion states the opposite, when also again adding the Alleluia verses after the reading."[183] If the action of those who omitted the allēlouarion was not owed to some rash anti-Latin tendency and action—we saw that in the West "Alleluia" was always considered as the Paschal hymn par excellence—its misinterpretation is unquestionable. This is also an example regarding how our mistaken theological views can turn destructive for the tradition and the centuries old liturgical taxis of the Church. A correct solution was fortunately given. Thus, in the forty-third chapter of the Typikon's preface, "Concerning the 'Alleluia' of the Epistle," we read: "In all Sacred Liturgies after the reading of the epistle, 'Alleluia' is chanted three times…Omitting the 'Alleluia' after the epistle and koinōnikon on the day of Pascha and the remaining days of Renewal Week is found nowhere in the ancient Typika, but on the contrary, at the end of each of the epistles of this week is found written 'Alleluia' three times with its verses; and the choirs ought to chant this" (M. Saliveros, Typikon, p. 37).[184]

183. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), v.

184. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 37.

511

Does the koinōnikon of Pascha, "Partake of the Body of Christ, taste the fountain of immortality,"[185] conclude with "Alleluia" or not?

The answers to questions 338 and 339 deal with subjects that concern the koinōnikon. It is good for what is written below to be correlated with those answers, because they constitute a prerequisite for its understanding. Similarly, the preceding answers, which concern the meaning and the liturgical use of "Alleluia" in other elements of divine worship, but nevertheless are related to its use as an ephymnion of the koinōnikon of Pascha, are likewise presupposed to be known.

In the first place, the koinōnikon is a psalm that is chanted antiphonally in its entirety with the "Alleluia" as an ephymnion/hypakoē for each verse. The psalm is selected either as exhortative toward holy communion, such as Psalm 33, "I will bless the Lord at all times...,"[186] or as correlated to the festal calendar theme of the day, such as the doxological Psalm 148, "Praise the Lord from the heavens...,"[187] for Sundays. This manner of selecting and chanting of the koinōnikon gradually fell into disuse, but the reading of Psalm 33 was preserved as a remnant, as a covering for similar liturgical practices, namely, the distribution of the antidōron, which chiefly survived in the Presanctified, and the distribution of the bread of the Artoklasia during the Great Vespers of vigils. Other manners of selection and chanting of the koinōnikon later prevailed probably for two reasons: first, because an entire psalm could not always be found where the content of all its verses is compatible with the eucharistic or festal calendar theme being sought; secondly and chiefly, because many people of the parishes were not able to know by heart the entire psalm and to chant together, a matter which was an indispensable condition for that old period. Thus, we come to the solution, which finally also became prevalent, for the communion

185. "Σῶμα Χριστοῦ μεταλάβετε, πηγῆς ἀθανάτου γεύσασθε."
186. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ..."
187. "Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν..."

psalm not to be antiphonally chanted in its entirety, but for the appropriate verse, the koinōnikon, to be selected, and, while it is repeated, for the entire psalm or its chosen verses to be recited with stichologia by the reader until the time is covered that the approach of clergy and people to communion required. With this system, the participation of the people in the chanting and the archaic requirement for the chanting of the entire psalm were ensured. However, at the same time, the necessary emphasis was also given to the verse that was chosen as appropriate for the circumstance, which with constant repetition preserved all the importance that its choice imposed as a koinōnikon. During the later phase, the key verse that was selected, the communion verse, alone remained and was chanted without stichologia, slowly and melodiously, according to the musical preferences of the period, but only during the communion of the sacred clergy, since the people customarily refrained from approaching the undefiled Mysteries. This briefly is the development of the koinōnikon, in many points parallel to the development of the prokeimena, with certain basic differences: the prokeimena also preserved the first verse of their psalm, and the koinōnika did not; the koinōnika always have "Alleluia" as an ephymnion, the prokeimena only by exception.

From what was written so far it became clear that as a rule the koinōnikon is a verse of a psalm with "Alleluia" as an ephymnion. Only a few exceptions exist. As for the first part of the rule, two koinōnika are not selected from the Psalter, but from the New Testament: a festal calendar one, the koinōnikon for Theophany from the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to Titus, "For the grace of God has appeared for the salvation of all humanity" (2:11),[188] and one eucharistic, the koinōnikon for the feast of Mid-Pentecost from the Gospel according to John, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him, said the Lord" (6:56). And they are closer to the rule. Furthest away from it are two other koinōnika, which are hymnological compositions: the koinōnikon for Great

188. "Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις." In the translation, the mistaken citation of the verse as 3:11 is corrected to 2:11.

Thursday, "Of your mystical supper...,"[189] and the koinōnikon for Pascha, "Partake of the Body of Christ, taste the fountain of immortality."[190] The first is a full troparion and its use as a koinōnikon during Great Thursday constitutes an entirely exceptional case, since the same troparion is also used instead of the Cherubic hymn, instead of "We have seen the true light...,"[191] and instead of "Let our mouths be filled with your praise, O Lord...."[192] In contrast, "Partake of the Body of Christ..." is clearly a communion hymn, brief and succinct, obviously most ancient, and also has the form of an ephymnion. Undoubtedly, it has been written for this specific use, namely, as a koinōnikon, such as also other ancient hymns that nowadays have fallen into disuse.

The use of "Alleluia" as an ephymnion/hypakoē of psalmic koinōnika is universal. Does this rule also apply regarding the non-psalmic koinōnika or those that due to their special nature constitute exceptions? For the first two of Theophany and Mid-Pentecost, there exists no problem. They are undoubtedly accompanied with "Alleluia." And while they are not verses of psalms, they are something related; also, themselves verses of Scriptural texts. There does not likewise exist a problem regarding "Of your mystical supper...." This one is not concluded with "Alleluia." It is a special case. Likely from the beginning it was not written as a koinōnikon or even if written, constitutes an exception, just as also other ancient koinōnika/troparia, which are not concluded with "Alleluia."

Therefore, the problem is located in the koinōnikon of Pascha, which the question concerns, and which is indeed controversial. If it does not have an "Alleluia," it must constitute the only exception among koinōnika. This decreases the possibilities that the omission of "Alleluia" is correct, but it does not confirm the opposite. All rules have exceptions.

Those who claim that the koinōnikon of Pascha does not have an ephymnion "Alleluia" put forward as an argument the fact that

189. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ..."
190. "Σῶμα Χριστοῦ μεταλάβετε, πηγῆς ἀθανάτου γεύσασθε."
191. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν..."
192. "Πληρωθήτω τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν αἰνέσεως, Κύριε..."

only in psalmic verses is its use justified. This is not accurate. As is well known, not only are the two New Testament koinōnika that we mentioned concluded with "Alleluia," but also other hymns and ephymnia, such as "Save us, O Son of God..."[193] of the third antiphon of the Divine Liturgy and the second of the "asmatic" service of the Trithektē (according to the earlier taxis),[194] the present-day second antiphon and the eisodikon of the Divine Liturgy, the unabridged oikoi of the Akathist, all the oikoi of the funereal kontakion of Anastasios[195] ("With the saints..."),[196] and so forth. Particularly characteristic is the case of the biblical verse that is chanted instead of the trisagion, "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ..."[197] (Galatians 3:27), which is sealed with "Alleluia."

Especially the use of "Alleluia," as an ephymnion of the koinōnikon in some manner, demands the more general use of this doxological angelical hymn at four main points of the Divine Liturgy, the "sacrifice of praise" of the Church. Indeed, if we pay atten-

193. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ..."

194. For studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

195. Much scholarly discussion and debate has taken place concerning the identity of Anastasios. This debate centers on whether he was a hymnographer prior to or after Romanos the Melodist and whether he can be identified as Anastasios the Quaestor (Ἀνάστασιος ὁ Κοιαίστωρ), ninth-tenth century. It is also debated whether Anastasios was a Sinaitic monk or Anastasios I of Antioch (r. 559–570, 593–599). He is attributed the composition of the kontakion to "Those who have fallen asleep" with the acrostic "Ἀναστασίου τοῦ ταπεινοῦ Αἶνος," also with a prooimion and twenty-nine oikoi, the text of which can be found in Jean Baptiste Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata* (Paris: A. Jouby et Roger, Bibliopolis, 1876), 1:242–244 and Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Ἐκλογὴ Ἑλληνικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ὑμνογραφίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1949), 116–119. This discussion is based on Ἀλέξανδρος Σ. Κορακίδης, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 2006), 3:248–249 and P. Bouvy, "Le cantique funèbre d'Anastase," *Échos d'Orient* 1 (1898): 262–264. The entire work with the kontakion (Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων...) and chanting of Alleluia is found in the service for the funeral of a priest in Μονὴ Σίμωνος Πέτρας, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 4 vols. (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2009), 3:109–115.

196. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων..."

197. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε..."

tion, we will confirm that the chanting of "Alleluia" prepares for or emphasizes the four principal points of the Church's sacred eucharistic synaxis: the entrance, as an ephymnion of the third entrance antiphon (nowadays second) and the entrance verse; the reading of the gospel text, as an allēlouarion; the entrance of the precious gifts, as an ephymnion of the cheroubikon or of its parallel hymns; and holy communion, as an ephymnion of the koinōnikon and of "Let our mouths be filled with your praise, O Lord...."[198] The fifth (fourth according to the liturgical order) key point of the Divine Liturgy, the consecration of the precious gifts, is prepared for with the chanting of the angelic doxological hymn, a parallel, as we saw in a previous answer, to the "Alleluia" of the trisagion hymn, "Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of your glory."[199]

Our question would find an answer in manuscript Typika or Pentēkostaria. Unfortunately, most commonly, almost always, only the beginning words, "Partake of the Body of Christ..." and not the entire text is placed in the ancient as well as in the modern liturgical books. We consulted approximately twenty of them, among which only the modern Typikon of the Monastery of Dionysiou notes in the margin: "At its end, 'Alleluia' is not chanted." On the other hand, the Typikon of the Monastery of Xēropotamou has the entire koinōnikon together also with "Alleluia." Both these manuscript Typika had been written during the past century.[200] It appears that the topic had been raised at the time and the compilers of these Typika took a position on it, the one expressly taking a negative position, the other in favor of the chanting of the "Alleluia" since exceptionally he copies it whole. But even the argument "from silence" is strong in our case. When all the Typika only note the beginning, it must be considered as self-evident that the koinōnikon of Pascha followed the well-known rule from practice, to which all the other koinōnika are aligned, namely, that it has, as those, "Alleluia" as an ephymnion. This is confirmed by a retrospection into the manu-

198. "Πληρωθήτω τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν αἰνέσεως, Κύριε..."

199. "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ, πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου."

200. Namely, the nineteenth century.

scripts and into the printed musical books. The older ones have "Alleluia." The modern ones, not.

If we go back now to the parallel case, which we saw in the previous answer, namely, of the tendency for the removal of the allēlouarion of Pascha, and to the relevant paragraph of the Typikon of the Great Church where there is a discussion regarding this (Preface, 43), we will find the solution to the question.[201] In the committee's fourth issue, the koinōnikon is not included in "concerning the 'alleluia' of the epistle reading,"[202] but a paragraph expressly mentions "and the koinōnikon."[203] Both texts are cited in question 510. I think that it is clear that this concerns precisely the same subject. The misinterpretation of "Alleluia," which was considered for the reasons that we reported there, as penitential and funereal, produced the false problem of whether it must be chanted during Pascha. Its attempted omission prior to the gospel reading failed at its birth. It found more suitable ground in the koinōnikon due the vagueness of the Typika. Despite the fact that it takes a negative position, as we saw, in the Preface, even the Typikon of Violakēs preserves the traditional vagueness in the standard rubrics for the day of Pascha: "Koinōnikon 'Partake of the Body of Christ....'"[204] It takes for granted, as do also all the ancient Typika, that the koinōnikon is concluded with "Alleluia." In any case, it is curious that the par-

201. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 37.

202. "Whether the alleluia ought to be omitted after the reading of the pericope from the Acts of the Apostles during Renewal Week, as was accustomed for some years, although the rubric in the Pentēkostarion states the opposite, when also again adding the Alleluia verses after the reading," Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), v.

203. "In all Sacred Liturgies after the reading of the epistle, 'Alleluia' is chanted three times... Omitting the 'Alleluia' after the epistle and the koinōnikon on the day of Pascha and the remaining days of Renewal Week is found nowhere in the ancient Typika, but on the contrary at the end of each of the epistles of this week is found written 'Alleluia' three times with its verses, and the choirs ought to chant this," Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 37.

204. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 371.

tisans of the innovation did not notice that "Alleluia" concludes the resurrection ephymnion of the second antiphon and the Paschal eisodikon ("Save us, O Son of God, risen from the dead, we who sing to you, Alleluia")[205] and did not extend their corrective mania to this either.

512

In the forefeast troparion for the Nativity, the word, "σήμερον" (today), is corrected by many to "Δέσποινα" (Lady) when it is chanted on another day outside of the eve.[206] Similarly, also in the kontakion for the feast of the Entrance, "σήμερον" (today) is corrected to "αὕτη γάρ" (for she), when it is sung in the days preceding the feast.[207] Is the correction correct or must it be chanted just as it is in the Mēnaia?

When we answered the question that concerned the correction of the phrase, "grant victory to the kings over the barbarians"[208] of the troparion for the Precious Cross, "O Lord, save your people...,"[209] without us wishing to encourage arbitrary corrective meddling in ecclesiastical hymns and apart from any political position, we tried to face the question as objectively as possible.[210] At the time, apart from

205. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ψάλλοντας σοι· Ἀλληλούϊα."

206. "Ἡ Παρθένος σήμερον/Δέσποινα, τὸν προαιώνιον Λόγον, ἐν Σπηλαίῳ ἔρχεται, ἀποτεκεῖν ἀπορρήτως, Χόρευε ἡ οἰκουμένη ἀκουτισθεῖσα, δόξασον μετὰ Ἀγγέλων καὶ τῶν Ποιμένων, βουληθέντα ἐποφθῆναι, παιδίον νέον, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων Θεόν" (The Virgin today/Lady comes to a cave to give birth ineffably to the eternal Word, Dance, O earth, on hearing; glorify with the Angels and the shepherds the one willing to be beheld as a young child, God before the ages).

207. "Ὁ καθαρώτατος Ναὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἡ πολυτίμητος παστὰς καὶ Παρθένος, τὸ ἱερὸν θησαύρισμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, σήμερον/αὕτη γὰρ εἰσάγεται, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Κυρίου, τὴν χάριν συνεισάγουσα, τὴν ἐν Πνεύματι Θείῳ· ἣν ἀνυμνούσιν Ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ· Αὕτη ὑπάρχει σκηνὴ ἐπουράνιος" (The most pure temple of the Savior, the inner room and Virgin, the sacred treasure of God, today/for she enters, into the house of the Lord, bringing in together the grace of the Divine Spirit, she whom God's angels praise is a heavenly tabernacle).

208. "νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων..."

209. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου..."

210. See question 417. The word "βασιλεύς" is used for emperors, kings, and other sovereigns. The mention of "political position" here refers to modern Greek debate between royalists and those opposing a monarchy.

the acclamation of kings, which (without any problem arising) from "O Lord, save your kings"[211] became "O Lord, save the pious,"[212] and the petition, "For our most pious and God-protected kings...,"[213] of the litany of peace and the ektenēs, which became "For pious and Orthodox Christians...,"[214] we noted various troparia that were adapted at times to the political and historical conditions.[215] We could multiply the examples but let us remain with the most important ones. The argument as put forward, that hymnological texts cannot receive correction, is shown by the same points to be weak. However, uncontrolled meddling must not in any way be encouraged because almost always it is destructive for the texts and invites undesirable corruptions into liturgical practice as well as disorder. We must be especially distrustful about corrections that lack support and are not confirmed by the manuscript tradition, but ostensibly are dictated by theological reasons, which most times are subjective theories and superficial interpretations of the matter. "O Lord, save your people..." constitutes a completely special case that if nothing else is up for discussion. Namely, while theoretically you can easily decide in favor of the preservation of the original wording for all the reasons that we mentioned above; in practice, especially when it is chanted at public events and provokes reactions, the difficulty of the matter becomes obvious.[216] In such cases, thanks to medium of television, this troparion is heard throughout the country being chanted in a corrected manner.[217] The particular circumstances impose it.

---

211. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς."

212. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."

213. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ Θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν..."

214. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν."

215. See questions 225 and 256.

216. In Greece, such public events can include the blessing of the waters on the feast of Theophany when politicians from all political spectrums might be in attendance.

217. In other words, the troparion is chanted in a politically neutral manner with the substitution of the phrase, "νίκας τοῖς εὐσεβέσι κατ' ἐναντίων..." (grant victory to the pious over the adversaries) for "νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων..." (grant victory to the kings over the barbarians). However, in many areas of contemporary Greece, with the passing of the generations that lived through the political turmoil of the Greek Civil War (1944–1949) and its aftermath as well as with the tendency for conservative youth to attend church

The recommended two corrections to the kontakia that are mentioned in the question are certainly not done by those who support and enforce the "hardline" position in "grant victory to the kings over the barbarians." Otherwise, they could be characterized as inconsistent.[218] However, those who are introducing and applying the corrective insertion into the two kontakia invoke other reasons. "Today" in the first troparion only suits the eve, during which the Panagia comes into the cave to give birth to "the eternal Word." In the second troparion, it is fitting only on the day of the feast, during which the commemoration of the entrance of the Theotokos into the temple is celebrated, in some manner, in its liturgical repetition. At that time, it is also repeated in a festal manner—something that happened in the past is considered present in the sense of so-called "liturgical time." This concerns a beautiful theological concept, which gives meaning to the feasts, as long as it does not go to extremes. "Today" is principally used in divine worship not always in a strict chronological sense for the day of the feast alone. The sacred events happened once during the past. The Church lives them as present, not only during their annual commemoration—par excellence of course during the feast—but also every day, which is raised up in a way to timeless divine reality. Thus, we celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord par excellence on the Sunday of Pascha, but we also see that "the whole economy of the Father" is made complete by the Lord on every Sunday and at every Divine Liturgy. We also remember "the third-day Resurrection" as present and "we see the type of His Resurrection" during the prayers of the Divine Liturgy. We live the Lord's crucifixion as "today" every Great Friday, but also during the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, every Friday, and the Sixth and Ninth Hour of every day. In all these instances, "today" is used. Namely, its chronological sense is entirely made absolute or relativized.

---

services, such substitutions are less frequently heard. In any case, service books containing the troparia have generally not included the corrections.

218. In other words, they could not maintain that these troparia not be changed and at the same time be advocating for the changes in question. The phrase being used may have a sarcastic undertone.

With these presuppositions, the quest for the real or theological meaning of "today" and its application to one and only concrete day becomes scholasticism, foreign to the spirit of divine worship. Not to mention that the chronological/worldly meaning of "today" is completely conventional to various places, a relative fluid meaning, a purely astronomical one in the flowing worldly reality.

Moreover, neither does the manuscript tradition also affirm or even encourage such a correction. During the afterfeast days, both troparia are everywhere encountered with "today" written with the meaning of the imminent or the present or the already celebrated feast. The recommended corrections preserve the meter in both cases (– – –) but destroy the poetic pulse and the aesthetic structure of the troparia. Especially the second correction ("αὕτη γάρ/for she") also disturbs the grammatical and syntactical sequence of the concepts of the kontakion.

And besides this, "today" is encountered not only in the two troparia above, regarding which the discussion takes place, but also in many other ones of these feasts and other feasts, in the days preceding or following the feast. Will we correct all these in order for our fastidiousness[219] to become satisfied?

513

Two archangels, Michaēl and Gabriēl, are depicted on the door panels of the altar's side doors. What is their proper placement? Why in some temples is Michaēl placed on the south door and Gabriēl on the north and vice versa in others?

The custom for the two archangels to be painted on the panels of the holy bēma's two side doors is relatively modern. Formerly and even nowadays, many temples have bēla—curtains with a simple sewn or embroidered cross.[220] In some temples with high wooden

219. Phountoulēs is using the word, "σχολαστικότητα," which sounds similar to "scholasticism" (σχολαστικισμός), but means, "fastidiousness, fussiness, pedantry."

220. The term "τὸ βῆλον/τὰ βῆλα" is derived from the Latin "velum/vela," which signifies a curtain or veil.

templons from the period of the Tourkokratia,[221] low carved bēma doors are placed at the side doors, in imitation of the beautiful gate, and preserve the original curtain for the section above. In modern times, in imitation again of the beautiful gate and obviously for reasons of the bēma's security, the construction of panels is customary, where the archangels are usually painted on them as guards of the entrances. The full bēma doors for the beautiful gate and side doors probably originated from Russian influence, where the old bēla were replaced for aesthetical reasons or even for climatological reasons. Although the older fashion is the preferable one, not only for reasons of tradition but also for practical and aesthetical reasons, the modern fashion (the side panels) continuously gains ground, as it seems, and the wooden carved ones with representations of the two archangels are preferred in our modern temples. There does not exist a special prescription for where each one must be located. In any case, it depends on the use of each side door and on the manner that the role of each archangel is explained. Michaël, as is well known, is the soldier archangel, the guardian and sentry of the entrances, who in some way with his presence prevents entrance to the unworthy. Thus, with a naked sword, he is represented on the frescos at the entrances of temples with relevant inscriptions that accompany the representation, or which are inscribed on the scroll that he holds in his left hand. Gabriël is the peaceful archangel, the conveyor of the message of the incarnation of God the Word, the bearer of the good news of our salvation. Consistent with their properties above, Michaël, would suit the entrance of the sacred bēma, which is the south side door, and Gabriël the north, from which the celebrants formally exit during the entrances, bearers in some manner of the gospel of love and God's communion to His people. However, those who prefer the opposite placement also precisely invoke these reasons, when reversing them. Michaël prevents the entrance from the gate, which is unsuitable to be used as an entrance, the north gate, while oppositely Gabriël in some manner welcomes those who enter into the bēma from its standard entrance, the south gate.

221. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

However, the first way probably is the one more preferrable and for the additional reason that Michaēl always has primacy in representations of the archangels and is portrayed on the right side of the icon. The placement of icons on the templon follows the same rules, just as also for the temple's remaining furnishings (right choir, despotikon). Thus, the icon of the Lord is always placed first on the right, the Theotokos first on the left, the Forerunner, according to the modern taxis, second on the right, the saint of the temple second on the left, and so forth. According to the same hierarchy, the place of the icon of Michaēl goes to the right and Gabriēl to the left, just as also in representations of the "deēsis."[222] This certainly concerns a secondary matter. However, it has more lasting consequences in the decoration of the temples since their iconographical decoration remains for centuries. Therefore, it is not so beautiful to observe this disorder. A small disorder, but in any case, disorder.

Let us note that in temples from the period of the Tourkokratia, apart from archangels, we also encounter other representations on the panels of the side entrances such as that of Christ the Good Shepherd, usually on the south door, or of full-bodied hierarchs.

We spoke above regarding "aesthetical reasons," which advocate that panels not be constructed on the sides, as well as naturally on the central gate of the holy bēma. The aesthetical reasons are naturally subjective. The large gates make the templon heavier, especially when it is fabricated from marble or mason, and gives the impression of a separating wall, which with its mass damages the sense of unity and harmony in the entire space of the temple. In contrast, the openings of the doors and the bēla lighten the mass and break up the aesthetical monotony of the templon. Finally, the absence of bēma doors and of a curtain on the beautiful gate also creates additional liturgical problems. Along with the high bēma doors, the Russians also preserve the curtain. As for the representations of the archangels Michaēl and Gabriēl who guard the entrance and their inscriptions, it would be interesting for us to quote what Dionysios of Fourna

222. "δεήσις" (entreaty, supplication, petition). An icon showing Christ as enthroned with others on both sides.

writes in *Explanation of the Art of Painting*,[223] where he captures and codifies the relevant Byzantine iconographic tradition:

Within the temple's gate on the right side make the Archangel Michaël with a sword, who holds a parchment that says:

Θεοῦ στρατηγός εἰμι τὴν σπάθην φέρων	I am God's general who bears the blade
καὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα εἰσιόντας ἐν φόβῳ	And those who enter here in fear
φρουρῶ, προμαχῶ, ὑπερμαχῶ καὶ σκέπω·	I guard, champion, fight for, and protect.
τοὺς δὲ καρδίᾳ ῥυπαρᾷ εἰσιόντας	But those who enter with a foul heart
πικρῶς ἐκτέμνω ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ τῇδε.	I harshly cut down with this sword.

On the left Gabriël, who holds a parchment and writes with a stylus these things:

Ὀξυγράφον κάλαμον τῇ χειρὶ φέρων	Bearing a swift writer's reed pen in hand
τῶν εἰσιόντων συνταγὰς ἀπογράφω·	I record the promises of those entering.
φρουρῶ στέργοντας· εἰς δὲ μή, φθείρω τάχει.	I guard the ones who keep them; but those who do not, I swiftly destroy.[224]

223. Dionysios of Fourna (ὁ Διονύσιος ὁ ἐκ Φουρνᾶ), ca. 1670–ca. 1745, a hieromonk and iconographer from the village of Fourna in central Greece, who maintained a workshop in Karyes, the capital of Mount Athos. His major writing was an iconographer's manual compiled during the first third of the eighteenth century. In 1909, Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus edited the work and created one of the titles under which the writing became known, *Explanation of the Art of Painting* (*Ἑρμηνεία τῆς ζωγραφικῆς τέχνης*). This discussion is based on George Kakavas, *Dionysios of Fourna (c. 1670–c. 1745): Artistic Creation and Literary Description* (Leiden: Alexandros Press, 2008).

224. *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς ζωγραφικῆς τέχνης*, ed. A. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς (St. Petersburg: B. Kirschbaum, 1909), 219, 283. Translation of the Gabriël inscription modified from Ivan Drpić, *Epigram, Art, and Devotion in Later Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge Unveristy Press, 2016), 29. The words, "Ὀξυγράφον κάλαμον," allude to Psalm 44:1, "Ἡ γλῶσσά μου κάλαμος γραμματέως ὀξυγράφου" (My tongue is a reed pen of a swift writing scribe). This psalmic verse is also found in the Polyeleos for feasts of the Mother of God. Through these expressions, a theological association is being made with the Annunciation. See also other discussions of the inscriptions in Drpić, 29–31, and Silvio Giuseppe Mercati, "Poesie giambiche di Niceforo Chrysoberges, Metropolita di Sardi," in *Collectanea Byzantina*, ed. Silvio Giuseppe Mercati (Rome: Dedalo Libri, 1970), 1:580–581. Mercati believes that the inscription associated with Gabriël may be alluding the angel of Sardis and the book of life in Revelation 3:1–6.

The "right side"[225] and "left"[226] here refer to the external gate of the temple, which is called a "royal gate."[227] However, by analogy, they also apply to the gates of the sacred bēma.

514

Why does the leavetaking for the feast of the Beheading of the Precious Head of the Forerunner (August 29) take place on the immediately following day?

In general, the feasts of saints do not have afterfeast days nor a day for the leavetaking of the feast. They are celebrated on only one day, the day of the commemoration for the saint being celebrated and are taken leave from on the same day. The feasts of the Lord and of the Mother of God alone have forefeast and afterfeast days, usually eight days, as well as a day of leavetaking. And very correctly so, because the special importance of the sacred events and their crucial significance for the salvation in Christ for the world are emphasized in this manner. Thus, the required theological equilibrium in the Heortologion is preserved. Otherwise, there would exist a danger of an overexpression of the feasts of saints and their equation to the exalted soteriological themes of the feasts of the Lord and of the Theotokos. An exception alone takes place for the feast of the Annunciation, which due to Great Lent is taken leave from on the same day. Nevertheless, it has an elementary forefeast and afterfeast covering, with the forefeast on the twenty-fourth of March and the synaxis of the archangel Gabriēl on the twenty-sixth of March, but mainly with the chanting of the Akathist Hymn—the kontakion of the incarnation of the Word—during the Friday Complines and the Saturday of the Fifth Week of the Fast.

According to the above, one would not expect the commemoration of the honorable Forerunner to have forefeast days or afterfeast days or a day of leavetaking of the feast. Nevertheless, it has an afterfeast day. And not only the Beheading, but also the Birth of the Forerunner (June 24). This is perhaps owed to theological reasons.

225. "δεξιὸν μέρος."
226. "ἀριστερόν."
227. "βασιλικὴ πύλη."

The honorable Forerunner is entitled to such a special honor, as the "greatest of those born of women,"[228] according to the testimony of the Lord himself (Matthew 11:11, Luke 7:28). However, most likely it is that this is a Stoudite influence. The katholikon of the Monastery of Stoudios was dedicated in the name of the Forerunner and the two-day celebration in all likelihood originates from there. In the final formation of the Byzantine Heortologion, the great influence of the Stoudites is well known.

We have one other exception in the commemoration of the Great Martyr Dēmētrios (October 26). Its afterfeast, which is also confined here to only one day, is arranged with the placement in it of the commemoration of the martyr Nestōr (October 27), in a historically reversed manner. The commemoration of Nestōr ought to normally precede. It follows in the Mēnaion, but the apolytikion and many troparia of Saint Dēmētrios are preserved in the service. Namely, it is a kind of afterfeast day according to the form of the synaxis for the archangel Gabriēl, which is the day following the Annunciation. Thus, from the influence of Thessaloniki, the honor of its great patron was preserved in the Heortologion as a two-day feast, having been adapted to the common pattern. In Thessaloniki already from the sixth century, it was three days, surrounded with a "forefeast" and "afterfeast celebration," as it seems from the three kontakia of Rōmanos the Melodist,[229] which were especially written for the three-day celebration of the saint in Thessaloniki. Around the end of the Byzantine period, the celebration had become fifteen days long in imitation of Pascha and of the Great Renewal Week. It was a unique exception, which eventually gave way to a two-day celebration, just as it was also preserved in the Mēnaia for the two feasts of the Forerunner, referenced in the question.

Finally, the celebration for the commemoration of the chiefs of the apostles[230] Peter and Paul (June 29) is also two days, with an

228. "ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων."

229. Rōmanos the Melodist (Ῥωμανὸς ὁ Μελωδός), sixth century hymnographer and saint. For an extensive discussion of this major hymnographer, see José Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origins de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977).

230. "τῶν κορυφαίων ἀποστόλων" (Lampe, s.v. "κορυφαῖος").

afterfeast day on the synaxis of the Holy Apostles (June 30). On this day, apart from the canon and the troparia of the Twelve, troparia for the chiefs are also again chanted, just as also in the other instances that we mentioned.

The existence of a double Vespers in the commemoration of the First and Second Finding of the Precious Head of the Forerunner (February 24) and of the Holy Forty Martyrs (March 9) is owed to another reason. In the respective Mēnaia on these days, a double Vespers is provided for, not on the eve, but on the day of the feasts above. Namely, February 25 and March 10 have two Vespers, one for the Forerunner and one for Saint Tarasios in the first case, and one for the Holy Forty and one for Saint Quadratus in the second. This is not about an afterfeast, but about a provision for a celebration of a Presanctified due to the fact that these saints, the Forerunner and the Forty, were celebrated by exception during the period of Great Lent. Similarly, but not precisely the same, is the case of the Vespers for the feast of the Annunciation, not of the eve, but of the same day of the feast. According to the most ancient taxis, a Presanctified was also celebrated on the feast of the Annunciation, and for this reason accordingly, while the feast is taken leave from on the same day, troparia for the feast and indeed two readings (from Exodus and Proverbs), especially chosen for the theme of the day, are provided for. However, according to the modern taxis, this Vespers has been incorporated into the service for the archangel Gabriēl, whose synaxis on March 26, as we said, is in lieu of an afterfeast for the Annunciation.

515

During the third repetition of Job 1:21, "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..." (Blessed be the name of the Lord...), which is chanted at the end of the Divine Liturgy, is it correct for an inversion of the words "Τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εἴη εὐλογημένον..." (The name of the Lord be blessed...) to be done or is it chanted just as it is in the original?

First of all, "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..." (Blessed be the name of the Lord...), is not a verse taken from the book of Job, but the second verse of Psalm 112 ("Αἰνεῖτε παῖδες Κύριον...," Praise the Lord, O servants...). In Job, only the first half verse ("Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον," Blessed be the name of the Lord)[231] is encountered word-for-word, but the second half is clearly different ("εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας," to the ages) and is indeed not encountered in the ancient manuscripts. Conversely, in Psalm 112, the whole verse is precisely encountered word-for-word: "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος" (Blessed be the name of the Lord from now on and forevermore). Moreover, while in Job, it is connected with the acceptance by him of the misfortunes of his life with patience and courage, in the psalm it is the beginning of a Paschal glorification, which is excellently adapted to the whole Paschal and doxological climate of the Holy Eucharist, of the Church's sacrifice of praise. Psalm 112 is the first psalm of the *Hallel* (Psalms 112–118), which were chanted during the Jewish Passover meal, the chanting of which the evangelists also refer to during the narrative of the mystical supper of the Lord ("when they sung a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives," Matthew 26:30, Mark 14:26).

This is obviously the case of a primitive element, which concluded the eucharistic synaxis, which connects us with this same tradition of the mystery from the Lord and its prefiguration from the Passover table of ancient Israel. As far as I know, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki first connects "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..." (Blessed be the name of the Lord...) to the parallel text of Job ("and thus the thanksgiving is said by all, which was also said by Job, 'Blessed be the name of the Lord,'" *Dialogue*, chapter 342),[232] whom other modern ones also follow. However, this dependence is completely improbable both for the strong reasons that we mentioned before and the fact that the liturgical texts are directly influenced by or are chosen from the psalms, rather than the book of Job. These are the points about the origin of the verse.

231. Job 1:21.
232. PG 155:617d.

As for the inversion of the words of the first half, which is done during its chanting at the end of the Divine Liturgy (not during its reading after the Artoklasia before Psalm 33, during vigils), the following could be observed.

In the first place, this is not a unique instance. Precisely the same thing also is done to the invariable first prokeimenon of the Matins gospel reading ("Πᾶσα πνοὴ αἰνεσάτω τὸν Κύριον – Αἰνεσάτω πνοὴ πᾶσα τὸν Κύριον)[233] and the prokeimenon for the Mother of God for Matins and Paraklēsis ("Μνησθήσομαι τοῦ ὀνόματός σου ἐν πάσῃ γενεὰ καὶ γενεά – Τοῦ ὀνόματός σου μνησθήσομαι ἐν πάσῃ γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ – or – Τοῦ ὀνόματός σου ἐν πάσῃ γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μνησθήσομαι).[234] All these things are not only done out of custom, but are also attested to by modern musical manuscripts. They obviously derive their origin from the old "asmatic"/parish chanting and practice, which very often "played" with musical or phrasal anagrams and inversions of verses, thus giving a more popular and more dynamic color to the sacred chanting. Examples: the putting first of parts of the ephymnion before the ephymnion during the chanting of the Beatitudes ("Ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου μνήσθητι ἡμῶν, Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου."),[235] the putting first of "Ἐλεῆμον"[236] for the chanting of the Psalm 50 and of the word or phrase of the first verse of the polyeleos or ekloges ("[Μακάριος] ἀνήρ. Ἀλληλούϊα."[237] "Δοῦλοι Κύριον. Ἀλληλούϊα,"[238] "Λόγον ἀγαθόν. Ἀλληλούϊα,"[239] "Τὴν οἰκουμένην. Ἀλληλούϊα,"[240] "Τῆς πραότητος αὐτοῦ. Ἀλληλούϊα,"[241] and so forth) or the repetition of the last phrase without grammatical and syntactical

233. "Let everything that has breath praise the Lord – Let the Lord everything that has breath praise."

234. "I will remember your name from generation to generation – Your name I will remember from generation to generation – or – Your name from generation to generation I will remember."

235. "In your Kingdom, remember us, O Lord, when you come into your kingdom."

236. "O merciful one." This addition to Psalm 50 is only done on Sundays.

237. "[Blessed] the man. Alleluia."

238. "Servants the Lord. Alleluia."

239. "A good word, Alleluia."

240. "The universe. Alleluia."

241. "Of his gentleness. Alleluia."

coherence in hypakoes, in the troparia of the prophecy, in the trisagion (or in those chanted instead of it) (for example, "Καὶ μάγους σοι προσήνεγκεν...,"[242] "Μάγους ὁδηγήσας..."[243] "Ποῦ γὰρ εἶχε τὸ φῶς σου λάμψαι..."[244] "Ἅγιος ἀθάνατος...,"[245] "Καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζομεν...,"[246] "Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. Ἀλληλούϊα,"[247] "Τὰ ἑκούσια καὶ τὰ ἀκούσια...,"[248] "Ἐν σοὶ γὰρ τὴν ἐλπίδα ἀνέθεντο...,"[249] "Καὶ ἀθανατίσας ζωώσῃς ἡμᾶς...,"[250] and so forth), and also the separation of a logically single verse, "Δόξα Πατρί... καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεί..."[251] into two independent individual verses.

A scholar clergyman of the past generation, influenced by the rationalism of his era, wrote and harshly criticized the many "absurdities" in the taxis of our worship. Among others, he characterized as "comically divided," the "Δόξα καὶ νῦν" (Glory both now). He was outside of liturgical reality. Hymnography and chanting are not a domain for a teaching of grammar but (sacred) poetry and (sacred) song. Namely, they have on their own the element of surpassing the ordinary nature of common speech and common recitation; they have their own logic. For this reason, also, poetic meter, alternation of musical tones, adjectives, elegance of style, grammatical and syntactical variations "by poetic license," permutations, anagrams, and inversions are employed. An aim both of hymnography and its melodic garment is the offering of the word of truth "with a certain harmonious comfort and pleasure which produces sound thought" (Basileios the Great, *On Psalm 1*).[252] This is the reason for the ana-

242. "It brought the Magi to you..."
243. "Guiding the Magi..."
244. "For where had shown your light..."
245. "Holy immortal..."
246. "And we glorify your holy Resurrection..."
247. "Have put on Christ. Alleluia."
248. "Voluntary and involuntary..."
249. "For they placed their hope in you..."
250. "And you will make immortal and endow us with life..."
251. "Glory to the Father... both now and ever..."
252. PG 29:212a–212b. Translation modified from Agnes Clare Way, trans., *Saint Basil Exegetic Homilies*, The Fathers of the Church, vol. 46 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 152.

gram or the inversion of the verse, to which the question refers—as long as it does not lead us to improvisations and excesses.

516

During the forty-day blessing of the baby, when it is about to be brought into the sanctuary according to the taxis, from which door do we enter, from the beautiful gate or from one of the others?

The manuscripts vaguely speak regarding the entrance of the baby into the bēma during the forty-day blessing, some generally when it is baptized irrespective of gender, but others regarding males alone irrespective of being baptized or not. The second is probably the most prevalent, and perhaps the most correct, on the one hand because rarely and only for reasons of necessity does baptism take place prior to forty days, but on the other because entrance into the bēma is reserved to males alone. And here it has the character, we can say, of an "anticipation" of the possibility for participation in the priesthood. In any case, the practice is presented as fluctuating. We have dealt with this issue in another question.[253] The current question concerns a detail, but one not negligible for the orderliness of the ceremony.

As far as I know, in the sources, it is not precisely specified from which door the entrance is done. Nor does a relevant indication exist in the printed Euchologia, which often have more detailed rubrics. I think this is due to the fact it is considered self-evident that the entrance into the holy bēma is done in all cases from the south side door unless the standard rubric provides otherwise. For example, such exceptions are the entrance of the priests from the north side gate if a deacon concelebrates after the service of the "kairos" and the use of the beautiful gate during the formal entrances of the Divine Liturgy and the rest of the services. Regarding the entrance into the holy bēma from the beautiful gate during the forty-day blessing, which the question implies, I have the impression that it is not orderly. At least according to theory in parishes—according to strict-

253. See questions 363, 379, 380, and 381.

ness[254] in monasteries—it always remains closed and opens only for useful reasons, when the taxis provides for it (an entrance, incensing, reading of the Gospel book, dismissal, and so forth). According to the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople, "the holy doors [the doors of the bēma] are never opened, unless for the beginning of Great Vespers when the priest alone censes, at all entrances of the Gospel book, namely, of Vespers and Liturgy; likewise, it is also opened from ['With fear of God…'] 'Draw near'[255] up until the completion of the Divine Liturgy."[256]

Two pieces of indirect evidence can perhaps enlighten us more. The first is the path of the priest with the baby and the veneration at the front of the holy table, towards the west, which appears to have been avoided.[257] If the entrance took place from the beautiful

254. This refers to the concept of "strictness" or "precision" (ἀκρίβεια) in the application of the Typikon.

255. "[Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ…] Προσέλθετε."

256. PG 154:752a. Philotheos Kokkinos (Φιλόθεος Κόκκινος) was a patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1353–1354/1355, 1364–1376) and, while abbot of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos, authored the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*) and the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας*). The *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*) provides direction on how the deacon serves with a priest in Vespers, Matins, and Liturgy. The text of this *Diataxis* may be found in PG 154:745–766. This is the work being cited above. On the other hand, when discussing elsewhere the "*Diataxis* of Philotheos," Phountoulēs is referring to the other work, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy*. Through this work's popularity and influence as a ceremonial, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* canonized the Athonite rubrics for the Eucharist that came to govern the present celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy. This discussion is based on Robert Taft, "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite," *DOP* 42 (1988): 191–194. Phountoulēs used this *Diataxis* as one of the sources for a modern publication of a Hierodiakonikon, *Ἱεροδιακονικόν, περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν διάταξιν τῆς Ἱεροδιακονίας εἰς τὸν ἑσπερινὸν καὶ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὰς τρεῖς λειτουργίας* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἐκδ. Πανσέληνος, 1989). The text of the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*) is published in Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 1–16.

257. The normal practice in Orthodox temples is for only ordained major clergy to stand in front of the holy table. However, standing on the sides and passage across the back are permitted for others serving in the altar.

gate, this would not have been possible. A second point, also itself indirect, is the representation of the Meeting of Christ in Byzantine iconography. In the background of the usual representation (Symeōn, Panagia, Iōsēph, Anna), the Byzantine iconographers recount the temple of Solomon, where the presentation of the baby took place. The sanctuary of the temple is portrayed in imitation of the sanctuary of the Christian temple with the doors of the bēma always closed. It is apparent that the artists are inspired by the corresponding liturgical practice of the Church, namely, the service of the forty-day blessing, which took place with the doors of the bēma closed consistent with the taxis that we described. The Byzantine iconographers did not randomly paint. They were knowledgeable of the precise taxis that they captured with fidelity. The fact that this is not done without reason is apparent from the corresponding representation of the Entrance of the Theotokos, where the doors of the bēma of the sanctuary are portrayed open, because, according to the tradition that is preserved in the apocryphal *Protoevangelium of James (Iakōvos)*, the Theotokos entered into the holy of holies of the Jewish temple, which also again is conventionally represented in imitation of the sacred bēma of the Christian temple. In a great many instances, Christian iconography offers valuable information that illuminates the liturgical taxis if it receives due attention, indeed especially when the direct literary sources and the standard rubrics are silent or are not absolutely clear.

517

Is the service of the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost concluded or not concluded with "Through the prayers of our holy fathers..."[258] and why?

The opportunity previously was given for us to write that "Through the prayers of our holy fathers..." is a type of sacred courtesy or greeting, which has its origin from a purely monastic custom.[259] "Fathers" does not mean the holy Fathers of the Church, but the fathers/

258. "Δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν..."
259. See questions 110, 401, and 426.

monks present, whose prayers are called upon by the person directing this phrase. It is often used even nowadays in monasteries either under the form above, namely, in the plural form, or occasionally in a singular form ("Through the prayers of our holy father..."[260] or "Through the prayers of our holy mother..."[261] in women's monasteries. Compare also "Through the prayers of our holy master..."[262] in hierarchical Liturgies and presiding outside the bēma[263]). It is said at the beginning of services, when a priest is not present, at trapeza, during visits and meetings of monks, in replacement of prayers and phrases in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (which have been said in the complete Liturgy and are omitted during it), and finally after the dismissal of services. This latter use of it, which was retained in parish practice from monastic influence alone, became a cause for it to be characterized as a "sealing verse"[264] or "seal"[265] of the services, without in fact being either a verse or seal. It would be more correctly compared to the polychronismoi[266] for the celebrants, which are said according to modern practice in parishes, such as "O Lord, protect for many years the one who blesses and sanctifies us"[267] or "O Lord, protect our master and hierarch, many years to you, O master."[268] At "Through the prayers...," the entreaties are more spiritual ("have mercy [and save] us"), at the other two parallel phrases more worldly ("protect for many years").[269] "Through the prayers..." is a development of the single focused prayer,[270] which was done by heart, and for this reason its form is not always fixed.

---

260. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν..."

261. "Δι' εὐχῶν τῆς ἁγίας μητρὸς ἡμῶν..."

262. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου δεσπότου ἡμῶν..."

263. For a detailed discussion of hierarchs presiding outside of the bēma, see questions 245–248.

264. "ἐπισφραγιστικὸς στίχος."

265. "ἐπισφράγισμα."

266. Acclaimed prayers asking that the Lord grant someone a long life. See question 396.

267. "Τὸν εὐλογοῦντα καὶ ἁγιάζοντα ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, φύλαττε εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη."

268. "Τὸν δεσπότην καὶ ἀρχιερέα ἡμῶν, Κύριε, φύλαττε, εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη δέσποτα."

269. "φύλαττε εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη."

270. "μονολογίστου εὐχῆς," the prayer to Jesus alone, namely, the Jesus prayer, "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ [Υἱε τοῦ Θεοῦ] ἐλέησόν με τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν." The adjective "μονολόγιστος" can be translated literally as "focused on one thing."

Its use as a courtesy under a form of prayer at the end of services, which is encountered in modern manuscripts and has nowadays become fully prevalent (apart from the Paschal period), and especially, as it seems, its use in parishes only during dismissals, connected it with them as a kind of signal word, indicative of the service's end. We say "signal," because in fact it has no element that indicates the dismissal, such as for example "Let us go forth in peace"[271] or "Let us go in peace and love of Christ"[272] of the Byzantine and other liturgical forms. Something analogous also happens with the beginning of services. And there, "Blessed is our God...."[273] indirectly signifies the start of the service and not directly such as "O come, let us worship...,"[274] and is even itself used, just as also "Through the prayers...," in other instances apart from the beginning, such as for example in the blessing of incense.

However, in any case, nowadays all the services begin and end respectively in some manner with two signal phrases, "Blessed is our God..." and "Through the prayers of our holy fathers...." The only exception as to the latter (apart from the period of Pascha, where "Christ is risen" is said) is the Vespers of Kneeling. The printed editions do not have it. Some priests do not say it, citing the printed liturgical books. Some say, "Through the prayers...," citing the common practice, either mistakenly or out of habit. The former also cite a "theological" explanation. Namely, that the kneeling of Pentecost as a first Vespers of the liturgical cycle, in some manner, does not have a complete dismissal in order that the endlessness of this cycle be signified; the uninterruptedness of divine worship. While beautiful, this explanation is also not so convincing. It leaves the impression that it was subsequently devised to justify a preexisting practice, as too often occurs in similar instances. We will attempt to look back into the tradition to see what precisely is happening.

The Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost, as it is arranged in our Euchologia (also in the Hieratika) and in the Pentēkostaria, follows

271. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."
272. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγάπῃ Χριστοῦ πορευθῶμεν."
273. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν..."
274. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν..."

the taxis for the monastic Vespers according to the Typikon of Saint Sabas.[275] In comparison with the ordinary festal monastic Vespers, it is shown to have more "asmatic" elements, apart from the four great prayers of kneeling that are particular to it. Namely, it preserves the three prayers of the small antiphons of the "asmatic" Vespers, integrated into the monastic Vespers but nearly in the position that they occupied in the secular Vespers. These second three small prayers of the three kneelings are: The prayer of the first small antiphon, "Blessed are you, O Lord...,"[276] the prayer of the second small anti-

275. In discussing the liturgical Typikon in general, the liturgical scholar Robert Taft states, "This type of typikon (τυπικόν) is one of two Byzantine liturgical books with rules governing the celebration of services: where the diataxis gives the rubrics regulating the ordinary structure of services, the typikon indicates what is proper to each day of the year. There are three types of liturgical typikon: the 'cathedral' Typikon of the Great Church for the rite of Hagia Sophia and other secular churches, and two 'monastic' forms, the Stoudite and Sabaitic Typika, which regulated services in monasteries," (Robert Taft, "Typikon," *ODB* 3:2131–2132). See also the brief discussion of the Typika by Phountoulēs at the beginning of questions 67 and 445. Saint Sabas (439–532), born in Cappadocia, travelled to Palestine and eventually established there the monastery of Mar Saba, the Great Lavra of Saint Sabas. On his life and monastic system, see Joseph Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to the Seventh Centuries,* Dumbarton Oaks Studies 32 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995) and Joseph Patrich, "Palestinian Desert Monasticism: The Monastic Systems of Chariton, Gerasimos, and Sabas," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 16 (1995): 1–9. The Typikon and monastic system under his name exercised a wide influence throughout the Byzantine and Slavic worlds and continues to exert a major role in the Orthodox Church. For a general assessment of the influence of Sabaite monasticism and specific studies covering a wide range of subjects, see Joseph Patrich, ed., *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 98 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2001). The Typikon of Saint Sabas was published in various editions in 1545, 1577, 1603, 1615, 1643, 1685, 1691, 1738, 1771, and 2009. For a discussion of these editions as well as the text of the Typikon of Saint Sabas that will be referenced in the present work (outside of manuscript citations), see Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012). In this edition, the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost is discussed on pages 376–384.

276. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε..."

phon, "Lord, O Lord, who delivered us...,"[277] and the prayer of the third antiphon (of the trisagion), "O great and eternal God...,"[278] with an extensive funereal addition from the phrase "For yours it is to show mercy and to save us..."[279] and following. It also preserves the prayer of the plērōtika from the "asmatic" Vespers as a third prayer for the third kneeling ("O great and most high God, who is worshipped in Holy Trinity..."),[280] which itself has fallen into disuse in the common monastic Vespers. The "asmatic" Vespers ended with the prayer of inclination, "O Lord our God, who bowed the heavens...,"[281] a kind of dismissal prayer behind the ambōn, and the diaconal petition, "Let us go forth in peace" or "Go forth in peace...."[282] It did not have the aposticha and the usual dismissal of the monastic form, "May Christ our true God, through the intercessions..."[283] and so forth. Naturally, it did not also have the usual "Through the prayers..." in the monastic form as a conclusion.

In the manuscripts, this ancient parish/"asmatic" form for the service of Kneeling is preserved. According to the outline above, these did not have either the particular dismissal or "Through the prayers...," as was expected. But also, nor did the manuscripts that have the Kneeling integrated into the monastic Vespers always have the particular dismissal and "Through the prayers...." They usually concluded the service with the phrase, "and dismissal" or "the priest does a dismissal." And this does not come as a surprise because they also so conclude the service in the ordinary Vespers. Some manuscripts have the particular dismissal in the well-known form of the printed editions from the thirteenth century onward or in another similar form, without also again "Through the prayers...." In the first case, which have "and dismissal," the usual form of the dismissal is probably understood, and for this reason, as being customarily known by the priest, it is not recorded. The special dismissal

277. "Κύριε, Κύριε, ὁ ρυσάμενος ἡμᾶς..."
278. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ αἰώνιος..."
279. "Σὸν γάρ ἐστιν τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν ἡμᾶς..."
280. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος, ὁ ἐν Τριάδι ἁγίᾳ προσκυνούμενος..."
281. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ κλίνας οὐρανοὺς..."
282. "Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ..."
283. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ταῖς πρεσβείαις..."

was later developed and is particularly successful. It summarizes the entire mystery of divine economy, as would be appropriate in the broadest sense to the end of the Paschal period, with the service of the Kneeling, which essentially concludes the movable cycle of feasts or marks the beginning of the fixed cycle—it is located at the interlude. It has a particular ancient form, since the soft spot (which in the common dismissals accepted and accepts augmentations and is beleaguered with the addition, despite the prescribed taxis, of many and varied names of saints) is only confined to the invocation of the Theotokos and of the "heralds of God and spirit-bearing Apostles."[284] The dismissal of the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost is said once a year and it was natural for it to preserve its ancient form and to remain undeveloped. Without doubt if it was said more often, such as the common dismissals that are said daily (and are developed and corrupted), it would have had the same fate as them. Namely, other names of saints would also be added, and it would be concluded with "Through the prayers...," just as also those. However, this does not pardon the celebrants, nor must it encourage them in the "modernization" in some manner of the ancient text. Again, if it is done from ignorance or lack of attention or negligence, as is sometimes unfortunately heard, then it is inexcusable. The service of Kneeling is one of the most beautiful and venerable services of our Church. It demands the pious attention and preparation of the celebrants to preserve and protect from the corruption of force of habit its distinctive particularities: Its wonderful prayers, the diaconal petitions "Again and again, bending the knees, let us pray to the Lord,"[285] "Help us, save us, have mercy on us, raise us up...,"[286] and the particular archaic dismissal, "May Christ our true God, who emptied himself from the bosom of the Father...on account of his own goodness. Amen,"[287] without the usual names of the saints and without the modern "Through the prayers...." This is about a venerable preserved remnant of our old liturgical tradition.

284. "θεοκηρύκων καὶ πνευματοφόρων Ἀποστόλων."
285. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι, κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
286. "Ἀντιλαβοῦ, σῶσον, ἐλέησον, ἀνάστησον..."
287. "Ὁ ἐκ τῶν πατρικῶν κόλπων...διά τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθότητα. Ἀμήν."

518

Are the entire contents of the paten (lamb and particles), the Body of Christ, changed[288] by the consecration, or not?

Three questions, 180, 181, and 182, earlier addressed the topic of the particles, to which we gave at the time an answer I believe as extensive and comprehensive as possible.[289] The first concerned the history and the significance of the particles and whether during the consecration they are changed into the Body of Christ, while the other two concerned relevant topics, whether the entire paten is raised during "The Holy Things are for the holy"[290] and whether the priest communes from his particle or from the lamb. I have the impression that the answer was clear: the lamb alone is consecrated, it alone is raised, and the priest communes, just as also the people, only from the lamb and not from the particles, because while they[291] are sanctified by participation when cast into the holy chalice, they are not changed into the Body of Christ.

At the time we did a retrospection into the history of the particles, namely, into ecclesiastical tradition and practice, and cited testimonies of ecclesiastical writers from Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429) onward, while seeking the solution for the question. Symeōn is the first one who deals with the subject of the consecration of the particles, which moreover more recently during the thirteenth century, had been introduced into Byzantine liturgical practice. Besides him, we saw what Theophilos of Kampania, Gabriēl Sevēros of Philadelphia, and Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain comparatively wrote.[292] The witnesses are unanimous

288. "μεταβαλλόμεναι." This plural present middle perfect feminine nominative participle refers to the plural feminine nominative noun "particles" (μερίδες, αἱ).

289. See also questions 529 and 591.

290. "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."

291. The particles.

292. Theophilos (ca. 1715–d. after 1793), born in Ioannina, was bishop of Kampania (1749–1795), teacher, and scholar. He was best known for the *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας*, which was first published in 1780 in Venice and subsequently republished as a popular work in successive editions. This work is a series of theological questions and responses composed in 110 short chapters and written in vernacular Greek. Saint Athanasios Parios (Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Πάριος)

and absolutely agree with what Saint Symeōn writes. For the relative completeness of the answer, we referred to the unclear testimony of Saint Germanos of Constantinople and to an equally vague reference to the particles by the sacred Nikolaos Kabasilas, as well as to the decisions of the Uniate councils and Pope Benedict XIV (1740–1758), which are in favor of the opposite position, namely, that the particles also change into the Body of Christ.[293] Perhaps the

(1722–1813) wrote the introduction. In addition, Theophilos authored a legal writing entitled, *Νομικόν,* which is divided into two parts that cover ecclesiastical and civil law, as well as a number of lesser works. In his writings, Theophilos was highly influenced by Eugenios Vulgarēs (Εὐγένιος ὁ Βούλγαρης) (1716–1806), one of the most important theologians and churchmen of this period. This discussion is based on Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft, 1453–1821* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 354–356, and Νικηφόρος Λ. Φορόπουλος, "Θεόφιλος. Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας," in ΘΗΕ 6:405-407. Gabriël Sevēros (Γαβριὴλ Σεβῆρος), (before 1540/41–1616), was born in Monemvasia with his primary education in Crete, travelled in Italy eventually living for a short time in Padua and Venice, and then was elected metropolitan of Philadelphia in 1577, but settled for the remainder of his life in Venice. He is famous for a large number of theological works including writings on calendar reform, on disputes with Latin theologians regarding the Filioque, and on the Eucharist. For an overview of his life and work, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821)* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 118–124. Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain (Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης) (ca. 1748–1809), a hieromonk of the Mount Athos canonized by the Church of Greece in 1955, was one of the most prolific Orthodox theologians in the modern period. The range of his writings covers almost every aspect of theological study. His most important canonical work, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (*Rudder of the Noetic Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox*), more commonly referred to as *Πηδάλιον* or *Rudder,* was first published in 1800 and continues to be one of the main collections of canon law presently used in the Greek-speaking Orthodox churches.

293. Benedict XIV, *Ex Quo Primum* (1 March 1756), § 40 in *The Papal Encyclicals 1740–1878,* ed. Claudia Carlen (Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing, 1981), 1:91, "But among the schismatics it is generally accepted that Simeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, betrayed certain doubts about the consecration of the particles in his treatise *de Sacramentis.* But everyone can easily see how unreasonable his doubting was. The priest at the sacred altar pronounces the form of consecration over the smaller particles no less than over the larger piece. Since his intention is equally aimed at consecrating all of them, and the matter of all of them is suitable for sacramental transformation, the smaller particles must certainly be consecrated too if the larger piece receives conse-

unclearness of the first two witness accounts and the reference to the practices of the ones belonging to the Greek rite complicated matters and provoked the new question above and similar inquiries of others. This made necessary the return to the subject of the particles, otherwise theoretically and practically of particular interest, since, as shown by the three older questions, it could have direct practical/ritual consequences (elevation of the entire paten, communion from the particles by the priest and people). The papal statements do not concern us and do not interest the Orthodox. We would not return to them nor to other witnesses who we cited in that answer. Of the other writers (Symeōn, Theophilos, Gabriēl, and Nikodēmos) we will refer only to Saint Symeōn in order to seek additional evidence for the consolidation and completion of the image of the relevant tradition regarding the particles. The request is, however, that the latest facts are related to what was written in the past both in terms of the history and the meaning of the particles and about the issues in contention, namely, the answer to the question whether they are consecrated or not, and consequently whether we commune from them as the Body of Christ or not. We will not repeat what we wrote there.

In Zagora of Pilion, a codex from the fifteenth century is preserved that belonged to Patriarch Kallinikos III of Constantinople and contains published as well as previously unpublished works of Symeōn of Thessaloniki.[294] The particular value of this manuscript

---

cration." For a general overview of the work of Benedict XIV, see Maria Teresa Fattori, "Benedict XIV and His Sacramental Polity on the Eastern Churches (1740–1758)," *Nicolaus, Rivista di Teologia Ecumenico-Patristica*, 39 (2012): 117–144. In describing Catholic conciliar activity affirming the consecration of the particles, Martin Jugie states, "Catholici vero ritus byzantini in communionem fidelium τὰς μερίδας consecrare solent," Martin Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*, (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1930), 3:223. The legislation of the Catholic Council of Zamośc (1720) in affirming the consecration of the particles is discussed by J. Bocian, "De modificationibus in textu slavico liturgiae S. Ioannis Chrysostomi apud Ruthenos subintroductis," in *XPYCOCTOMIKA: Studi E Ricerche Intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo a Cura Del Comitato Per Il Xvo Centenario Della Sua Morte* (Rome: Pustet, 1908), 951–955.

294. Pilion was a municipality in Thessaly where the village of Zagora is currently located. Patriarch Kallinikos III of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. 1757)

is the fact that Symeōn himself has corrected it with his own hand. This is the codex of the Library of the Community of Zagora under number 23.[295] There, in chapter 94 of the *Dialogue*, in the margins of fols. 34–35 of the manuscript, Saint Symeōn adds a very long supplement to what he writes there concerning the particles, part of which we quoted in that answer.[296] The addition was published by David Balfour in 1981 together with other works of Symeōn unpublished until then.[297] The insertion is done at precisely that point where the citation of the excerpt of the *Dialogue*, which we published at the time, ends after the phrase "and to take of the divine Body with the labis."[298] There, he[299] summarized what he wrote and concluded concerning the particles, as usual, humbly: "It is also true that all the particles placed in the chalice have received a share of both the Body and Blood of Christ, and he who partakes of them, which are joined with these things, communes of His Body and Blood; yet it is better, I think, to watch for and to take of the divine Body with the labis."[300] The *Dialogue* was circulated with this text,

---

was a native of Zagora.

295. Current information on the library may be found at http://www.library-zagora.gr (accessed September 3, 2021).

296. The text of the supplement is edited and translated in Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 224–230. In this answer, Phountoulēs uses his own edition of the work, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "*Περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας*," in Ἡ Θεία εὐχαριστία. Εἰσηγήσεις, *πορίσματα*, ἱερατικοῦ συνέδριου τῆς ἱερᾶς μητροπόλεως Δράμας (*Δράμα, Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολη Δράμας*, 2003), 194–371.

297. David Balfour, *Ἔργα θεολογικά, Ἁγίου Συμεὼν ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, 1416/17-1429: Κριτικὴ ἔκδοσις μετ' εἰσαγωγῆς, Ἀνάλεκτα* Βλατάδων 34 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1981). See also Balfour's other studies of Symeōn: *Politico-Historical Works of Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonika 1416/17 to 1429): Critical Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, Wiener Byzantinische Studien XIII (Vienna: Verlag der *österreichischen* Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979), "St. Symeon of Thessalonika: a polemical hesychast," *Sobornost* 1 (1982): 6–21, and "Saint Symeon of Thessalonike as a historical personality," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 28 (1983): 55–72.

298. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 222–223.

299. Symeōn.

300. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 222–223.

as it appears from the fact that the supplement does not exist in any other manuscripts as well as in printed editions.[301] It is obvious that criticisms were raised. Either the position of Symeōn clear in other respects was not understood, or from his phrases "It is also true" and "I think" his writings were considered his subjective positions, not sufficiently supported in the tradition of the Church. In fact, they may have encouraged those who, either because they believed that the particles are changed into the Body of Christ or through negligence, communed the faithful also from them indiscriminately.

In this addition, Symeōn, with the well-known circular manner of his thought, returns to previously expressed views (while avoiding any moderation or reservation), completes, analyzes, and strengthens them with arguments from the tradition and the liturgical practice of the Church, "although these things are not of a dogmatic height."[302] He repeatedly emphasizes that he expresses "the most ancient" tradition of the Church "from the beginning" and "always follows the [customs] of the Church, as is proclaimed by her."[303]

Symeōn's arguments are in short, the following: Communion is imparted just as the Lord handed down and just as we received it from the holy Fathers. The apostles partook of both the Body and Blood of the Lord. Although the commixture of the Body and Blood of the Lord preceded, the celebrants partake separately of the precious Body and Blood. The laity also partook in this manner. However, afterwards, the labis was introduced by the Fathers "on account of some incidents."[304] The particles are commixed with the precious Blood and Body, which has been made "into small

301. In other words, the text did not circulate with the supplement written in the margins, but only with the summary written in the text.

302. There is a disagreement over the transcription of this text between Phountoulēs ("εἰ καὶ οὐ δογματικῆς ταῦτα ἀκμῆς," which Phountoulēs translates in modern Greek as "ἔστω καὶ ἂν δὲν εἶναι αὐτὰ θέματα ἀπολύτου δογματικῆς ἀκριβείας") and Hawkes-Teeples ("εἰ καὶ οὐ δογματικῶς ταῦτα φημί," which the latter translates as "even if I cannot say this dogmatically"), see *Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "Περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας,"* 330 and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 230–231.

303. See the text in Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 230, where differences with the edition of Phountoulēs are noted.

304. "διά τινα ἐπιγεγονότα."

pieces."[305] Inasmuch as the particles are in this way "entirely"[306] commixed and full of the Body and the Blood of the Lord, the believer communes of the Body and the Blood of Christ together with them. However, it must not proceed to be done in this way, but for the priest to take with the labis the Body itself and to impart it to the communicants together with the precious Blood, just as the divine tradition requires. And this is because the particles, which are offered in the honor of the saints and for a means of atonement for the living and dead, are not changed into the Body of Christ, except only the lamb. And here is why:

- In the prothesis, only one loaf is offered "in remembrance of the Lord."[307] The lamb is excised from it and the commixture of the chalice is done. The particles are afterwards excised and offered from other loaves (This is the precise taxis).
- When a Presanctified is about to be celebrated, other loaves are also offered according to the number of the Presanctifieds, lambs are excised, the commixture is done, and afterwards the particles are offered. Only the loaves are offered "in remembrance of the Lord."
- Only the loaf that was elevated, and from which the lamb came, is cut and distributed as antidōron. The remaining prosphora, from which the particles of the saints came, are not called antidōron (This is the old precise taxis. Symeōn mentions that the loaf, from which the particle for the Theotokos was excised, was also distributed as antidōron "on account of her honor"[308]).

---

305. "εἰς λεπτά."
306. "καθάπαν."
307. "εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ Κυρίου."
308. "διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς τιμήν." Here, the translation of the text ("Δεύτερον δε, ἐξ ἧς ἡ μερὶς τῆς θεοτόκου, διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς τιμήν") differs between Hawkes-Teeples ("Next [comes] the second one, out of which comes the particle of the Theotokos, in Her honor") and Phountoulēs ("The bread from which the particle of the Theotokos is called a second antidōron on account of the honor that befits her" based on a reading of the text as "Δεύτερον δὲ ἀντίδωρον λέγεται ὁ ἄρτος ἀπὸ τὸν ὁποῖο βγῆκε ἡ μερίδα τῆς Θεοτόκου, γιὰ τὴν τιμὴ ποὺ τῆς ἁρμόζει"), Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 227 and *Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "Περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας,"* 327.

- During the "completion,"[309] namely, during the consecration, the priest says, "and make this bread,"[310] and not "these breads,"[311] since the particles are also on the paten. However, when more lambs are on the paten for the celebration of a Presanctified, then he says, "these breads"[312] (According to the prevailing practice, this phrase is always said "in the singular."[313] Symeōn has in mind another relevant tradition).
- During the elevation, the priest only elevates the lamb, not the particles.
- In the event there are many lambs (in anticipation of celebrating Presanctifieds), he elevates all the lambs, not the particles.
- When he breaks the bread, he places its "upper section"[314] into the chalice, and not from the particles.
- He communes and offers pieces of the lamb to the deacons, and not from the particles.
- For the celebration of a Presanctified, he reserves a complete bread[315] and not particles.
- Similarly, during Great Thursday, he keeps complete bread/lamb as the reserved consecrated elements and not particles.

309. "τελείωσιν."
310. "καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον."
311. "τοὺς ἄρτους." The word "these" is implied.
312. "τοὺς ἄρτους τούτους."
313. "ἑνικῶς."
314. "τὸ ἄνω τμῆμα."
315. "τέλειον ἄρτον" (complete bread) appears used here to signify "consecrated bread." See the discussion in Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalbnika*, 227, n. 144. Hawkes-Teeples associates the "complete bread" with the "completion" (τελείωσις) or consecration. The same sense is discussed by Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. V, The Precommunion Rites*, OCA 261 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2000), 382.

- During the ordination of a presbyter, the hierarch hands as a trust into the hand of the newly ordained a complete bread[316] and not a particle, when saying, "Receive this trust...."[317]
- Finally, the priest always offers the loaf of the prothesis, from which the lamb is excised. However, in some places, the deacons also offered particles (This is about an older custom, which Saint Symeōn prohibited).

This basically is the argumentation of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, as it is framed in the addition, which he inserted with his own hand into the original text of his *Dialogue*. Of course, not all the arguments presented have the same probative value. However, all together they express as he says in another instance, "the mind of the Church,"[318] namely the meaning that it gives to every worship practice, its theological position on the issues under discussion. Blessed Symeōn also shows with his examples the right way of a pious and humble approach to these delicate issues. He allows the Church's tradition and practice to give the answer. And I think that both the tradition and Saint Symeōn, who highlights it and tactfully interprets it, are both clear. The later writers who we mentioned (Theophilos of Kampania, Gabriēl of Philadelphia, and Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain), chiefly rely on Symeōn, whether they mention him or not. It appears that other witnesses regarding this subject do not exist or at least we were not able to locate them, despite the pertinent retrospection into the sources. In any case, the existing ones are clear and unanimous. Based on them, the detailed rubric of the Slavonic Euchologion is composed, which summarizes with preciseness the relevant tradition: "Take the portion IΣ and put it into the holy chalice. Divide the portion XΣ for the priests and deacons, the ones celebrating. Keep both portions NI KA for the communion of the faithful and subdivide them into as many small pieces as also those communing. As for the particles in honor of the holy Virgin and of the nine heavenly ranks and saints, which are found on the

316. Namely, a lamb.

317. "Λάβε ταύτην τὴν παρακαταθήκην..." "Παρακαταθήκην" is translated here as "trust," but elsewhere "the reserved consecrated elements."

318. "τὸν νοῦν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας."

paten, do not use them for communion, but limit yourself only to the two portions above" (P. Trempelas, *The Three Liturgies*, Athens, 1935, p. 132).[319]

519

Why is Saint Prokopios commemorated in the dismissal for the service of marriage?

In the answer that concerned the reason for preferring certain epistle and gospel pericopes in commemorations of saints, we saw that one criterion for selection was also the name of the saint.[320] Thus, for example, for us to focus only on the saints celebrated during the month of September, the pericope 2 Corinthians 6:1–10 is chosen for Saint Euphēmia (Εὐφημία) for the phrase, "διά δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας" (in ill repute and good repute),[321] the pericope Ephesians 6:10–17 for Saint Eustathios (Εὐστάθιος) for the phrases, "πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι...Στῆτε οὖν" (for you to be able to stand... Stand therefore),[322] the pericope 1 Corinthians 16:13–24 for Saint Grēgorios (Γρηγόριος) the Illuminator for the phrase, "Ἀδελφοί, γρηγορεῖτε" (Brethren, be watchful),[323] for the same one the gospel pericope Matthew 24:42–48 for the same word, "Γρηγορεῖτε, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε..." (Be watchful, because you do not know...).[324] Something similar is done to a greater extent in hymnography, which is full of assonances and plays on words with the names of saints, when of course they lend themselves to it. Finally, the Mēnologion's iambic couplets of Christophoros the Patrician of Mytilene almost systematically "play" with the names of the saints.[325] This is the scholarly aspect of the subject.

---

319. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 132.

320. Question 449.

321. 2 Corinthians 6:8. The commemoration takes place on September 16 and July 11.

322. Ephesians 6:11, 14. The commemoration takes place on September 20.

323. 1 Corinthians 6:13. The commemoration takes place on September 30.

324. Matthew 24:42.

325. Christophoros the Patrician of Mytilene (Χριστοφόρος ὁ Πατρίκιος τοῦ Μυτιληναίου) was an eleventh century imperial official. According to Alexander Kazhdan, he "wrote four calendars of Saints: two in classical meter

The people did something analogous, but in their own way. They associated the name of the saint with certain qualities which were attributed to him/her, whether they were based on the events of his/her life or even not. Thus, up until even nowadays, they invoke Saint Eleutherios (Ἐλευθέριος) for the ἀπελευθέρωση (deliverance) of women about to give birth, Saint Phanourios (Φανούριος) for the φανέρωση (disclosure) of lost items, Saint Akindynos (Ἀκίνδυνος) and those with him as well as Saint Sōzon (Σώζον) for σωτηρία (salvation) from κινδύνους (dangers), Saint Therapōn (Θεράπων) or Saint Iōannēs (Giannēs) (Ἰωάννης, Γιάννης) for a θεραπεία/ἴαση (cure) (ὑγιαίνω, I am healthy) of illnesses, Saint Iakōvos (Ἰάκωβος) (ἀ–κωφός/non–deaf) for illnesses of the ears, and so forth.

The composers of some prayers of our Euchologion are influenced by this popular piety, such as for example the prayer "for difficult children,"[326] where there is an invocation to the apostle Matthias (Ματθίας) (based on the assonance from the verb "μανθάνω," "I learn") and to the martyrs Agapētos, Prokopios, and Philētos. In the service of marriage, the influences of popular piety are greater due to the nature of the rite. In any case, they are confined to its more recent elements, to later prayers, to troparia, and its dismissal. Later prayers that have been introduced after the detachment of marriage from the Divine Liturgy are the first two lengthy prayers of marriage, as well as the second wordy prayer of the betrothal. Commemorated in them are names of couples chiefly of the Old Testament, but also the "crowns"[327] of the holy Forty Martyrs. Troparia are by custom chanted of the holy "God-crowned"[328] sovereigns Kōnstantinos and Helenē. Finally, in the dismissal, the most corruptible element of the service, because it is often said by heart, not only are the "God-crowned" holy sovereigns Kōnstantinos and Helenē commemorated, but also Saint Prokopios (Προκόπιος). The dismissal is so encoun-

(iambs and hexameters), and two in isosyllabic meters—one very concise (in stichera), another a little more expanded (in kanones); the last is called a synaxarion in some manuscripts" (Alexander Kazhdan, "Christopher of Mytilene," *ODB* 1:442).

326. "εἰς παῖδας κακοσκόπους."

327. "στέφανοι."

328. "Θεόστεπτοι."

tered in the printed editions, but also in isolated manuscripts already from the thirteenth century (*Codex Athens 670*). Saint Stephanos (Στέφανος) is also by custom commemorated in some places. The commemoration of the first two saints and of Saint Stephanos is explained from the association of the epithet that always accompanies the first ones ("God-crowned"), and that of the second from his very own name.[329] The invocation of the holy great martyr Prokopios is analogous with that of the prayer "for difficult children," which we saw. Saint Prokopios is presented, consistent with his name, as in some manner the incarnation of προκοπή (progress) and a wish for progress. What is said in the words of the last prayer of blessing, "May the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the all-holy…Trinity…grant to you…progress (προκοπήν) in life and faith…," is said in the dismissal in a more esoteric and popular manner, with the commemoration of the saint whose name means progress.

The popular approach of the matter perhaps surprises us a little, but divine worship is not aloof from this popular element. It is not only intended for scholars, but also for the majority of God's people. There is room for the most learned to view this with more sympathy and understanding. Moreover, the case of Saint Prokopios is special and particularly impressive. According to his synaxarion, the Lord gave him the name "Prokopios" during His appearance to him in course of his martyrdom: "You are no longer Neanias [this was the name of the martyr], but you will be appropriately named Prokopios. Therefore, be strong and be manly, for while progressing you will make progress…."[330] By the sacred hymnographers, he is praised as "προκόπτων ἐν Θεῷ" (progressing in God) (doxastikon of lauds) or "τῇ πίστει προκόπτων" (progressing in faith) (kontakion – oikos) or "φερωνύμως προκόπτων" (appropriately named one who progresses) (exaposteilarion). In the first idiomelon of the stichēra of lauds, he is characteristically connected with the progress of the faithful: "ὡς

329. The name Stephanos (Στέφανος) is identical to the Greek word for crown.

330. *Acta Graeco-Latina S. Procopii Ducis, fabulositatis suspecta* 35 (*AASS* 29:565). There is a play on words in this account with "Νεανίας," meaning "youth," and the verb, "ἀνδρίζω," meaning here in the passive "make a man of, make manly."

προκόπτων ἐν Θεῷ πάντας πρέσβευε, ἀθλοφόρε, προκόπτειν ἐν αὐτῇ... ἐν θεαρέστοις ὁδοῖς καὶ θείαις πράξεσιν εὐαρεστοῦντας αὐτῷ" (as one progressing in God intercede, O victorious one, for all to progress in Him...pleasing Him in God-pleasing ways and divine acts).[331] Namely, all the reasons above contribute to Saint Prokopios especially being considered identical with progress: his name, his synaxarion, lay piety, and sacred hymnography.

It is completely unlikely that the invocation of Saint Prokopios during the dismissal of marriage is owed to the fact that he persuaded the twelve senators' wives to deny "their spouses also the joys of marriage" and to prefer martyrdom and Christ the Bridegroom, as it has been written in the past. And even if this was precisely the case, which according to the synaxarion is quite different, it does not justify the reference of his name in marriage. It would rather be fitting to the monastic tonsure.

520

Why is the Monday after Pentecost—of the Holy Spirit—called a feast of the Holy Trinity?

On the Monday after Pentecost, we indeed celebrate, according to the description of the synaxarion of the Pentēkostarion, "this all-holy, life-creating, and almighty...Spirit, one of the Trinity, God equal in honor and consubstantial and equal in glory to the Father and Son." The text of the synaxarion is an important text, which (as well as all the synaxaria of the Triōdion/Pentēkostarion) was written by Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (fourteenth century).[332] And in both the synaxarion for Monday and in the synaxarion for the Sunday of Pentecost, mention is made regarding "a division" of the

331. Compare the translation of these hymns in Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The July Menaion* (Brookline, MA: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 2005), 48, 50.

332. Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos (d. ca. 1335) was a priest of Saint Sophia, made significant contributions to hymnology, to the interpretation of liturgical texts, as well as to the composition of prayers and synaxaria, and wrote a church history, the surviving text of which extends to the seventh century, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 705–706.

great feast into two days, which vaguely has its beginning from the holy Fathers ("it seemed good to the holy Fathers to divide the feasts on account of the majesty of the all-holy and life-creating Spirit because He is one of the holy and life-giving Trinity" and "but the divine Fathers who rightly regulated all things decreed to celebrate Him both separately and on the day of Pentecost on account of the honor for the Holy Spirit," synaxaria for Sunday and Monday respectively). In the manuscripts of Xanthopoulos, a tendency for an elevation of Monday's feast is rather evident, a kind of parity to the actual feast of Pentecost that is celebrated on Sunday. The highest honor due to the Holy Spirit, one of the Holy Trinity, is put forward as a reason. Thus, mention is made of a "division," as we said, of the one unified feast, namely, of its two-day celebration, while indeed avoiding the common term "Synaxis" (Σύναξις) for its characterization, apparently invoking the equality of the persons of the Holy Trinity. At this point, obviously, the seed for making the feast of the Holy Spirit into a feast of the Holy Trinity is found.

Hymnography at least five centuries earlier (Kosmas,[333] Damaskēnos,[334] Leōn the Wise[335]) already had a strong trinitarian color. The well-known doxastikon of the plagal of the fourth tone by the lord Leōn,[336] "Come, O people, let us worship the Divinity of three hypostases...,"[337] which in the present service concludes the stichēra of Vespers for Pentecost and the aposticha of the Vespers of Kneeling, especially leaves the impression that it was not primarily written for the visitation of the Holy Spirit, to which it has no specific reference, but as a synopsis of the dogma concerning the Holy Trinity. But also, other troparia of the feast (fourth, seventh, and eighth from the stichēra for Vespers, first and third idiomelon of the Litē, both exaposteilaria, the first two stichēra of lauds, and quite a few troparia of both canons) systematically combined the subject of the feast with trinitarian doxology. By its nature, Pentecost had a clear trinitarian

333. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).

334. Saint Iōannēs of Damascus (ca. 650 or ca. 675–749 or 753/4).

335. Leōn VI the Wise, emperor (886–912).

336. The term "lord" (κυρίου) used in this context indicates the elevated status of Leōn VI the Wise as emperor.

337. "Δεῦτε λαοί, τὴν τρισυπόστατον Θεότητα προσκυνήσωμεν..."

character, as also did the feast of Theophany, and partly that of the Transfiguration.

In any case, though, it appears that originally the celebration of Pentecost was limited to only one single day, Sunday. It did not even have afterfeast days, as can be gathered from the Typikon of Saint Sophia from the ninth–tenth centuries, which is preserved in the codices of *Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*. This is possibly due to the literal implementation of the characterization of Pentecost as "a last and great day"[338] or "consummate feast,"[339] which concludes the cycle of the so-called moveable feasts. But perhaps also the particular development of its Vespers—the Vespers of Kneeling—is intended to emphasize this service, which is precisely found at the borderline between moveable and fixed feasts, and in some manner seals the former ones and inaugurates the cycle of the services of the general liturgical year. Indeed, in the Typikon above of the Great Church, the leavetaking of the feast is done, so to speak, on the same day, since not even the feast of the Holy Spirit of the later Byzantine festal calendar is listed on the Monday. While the service of the earthquake was chanted at Saint Sophia, the synaxis was celebrated at the great Holy Apostles.[340] This synaxis would naturally be extended to a

338. "ἐσχάτης ἡμέρας καὶ μεγάλης."

339. "παντελείου ἑορτῆς."

340. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2:140–141. The text from the Typikon reads, "*Τῇ β' ἤγουν τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς Ν', σύναξις τελεῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ πανευφήμων ἀποστόλων ἐν τῷ σεπτῷ αὐτῶν μεγάλῳ ἀποστολείῳ, τῆς λιτῆς ἔωθεν ἀπὸ τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας ἀπερχομένης ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἐκεῖ συνήθεις εὐχὰς παραγινομένης ἐν τῇ εἰρημένῃ συνάξει, καὶ τῆς θείας λειγουργίας καὶ μυσταγωγίας ἐκεῖσε ἐπιτελουμένης.*" In the analysis of this text above, "At the great Holy Apostles" (*στοὺς δὲ μεγάλους Ἁγίους Ἀποστόλους*) refers to the temple in Constantinople dedicated to them. For a discussion of the feasts celebrated in this temple, see Raymond Janin, *La Géographie Ecclésiastique de L'empire Byzantin*, vol. 1, *Le Siège de Constantinople et Le Patriarcat Oecuménique*, pt. 3, *Les Églises et Les Monastères*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1969), 46–47. For a discussion of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005):

second day for the feast of Pentecost in imitation of other great feasts of the Lord and Mother of God, during the second day of which the most important person who participated in the event being solemnized (Nativity–Theotokos, Theophany–Forerunner, Meeting of Christ–Symeōn and Anna, Annunciation–Archangel Gabriēl, Nativity of the Theotokos–Iōakeim and Anna) is celebrated. Thus, also, in the case of Pentecost, the synaxis of the Apostles probably should have become accordingly prevalent, but the pre-existing old feast of the Chief Apostles prevented it, as well as the synaxis after it of the Twelve Apostles (June 29–30), which directly neighbors Pentecost. Nevertheless, the *Apostolic Constitutions* (5.20) mentions a celebration a week after Pentecost. However, it is referring to the breaking of the fast during this week and, after this, to the beginning of the fast of the Holy Apostles. It is very early for "afterfeast days"[341] to be meant in the modern liturgical sense of the term.

In this historical and liturgical framework, the feast of the Holy Spirit of the Monday after Pentecost, emerges, unknown precisely where and when, either as a "division" of the originally unified feast or as a "synaxis," with claims of prominence due to its lofty subject matter. This also thus occurred with the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross (September 14), which from a second day/synaxis for the feast of the Dedication of the Temple of the Resurrection (September 13) ended up, due to its lofty subject matter, exceeding and overshadowing the otherwise originally local Jerusalemite feast of the Dedication.

The feast of the Holy Spirit on the Monday after the Sunday of Pentecost, despite its exceptionally great subject (the Holy Spirit), never attained the proportions of the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross nor overshadowed Pentecost. It remained as a second day of a great feast of the Lord, with a clearly secondary liturgical and festal calendar character, according to the form of the synaxes

---

73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

341. "μεθέορτα."

of the great feasts that we mentioned above. For this reason, also, it is essentially unimportant whether we characterize it as a feast or synaxis. As apparent from its liturgical content, this is a case of the same thing. It does not have either a polyeleos or gospel reading in the Matins, nor is a vigil provided for it. Apart from this, the hymnography of Pentecost is repeated with insignificant changes to the troparia of lauds (the printed Pentēkostarion indeed repeats troparia and canons without a particular reason). The only differentiating element is the synaxarion (of Xanthopoulos) and the iambic couplet, which, if it is the work of the Christophoros the Patrician of Mytilene (tenth century), must be the most ancient witness for the existence of the feast or the synaxis ("Let everything that has breath glorify the Spirit of the Lord,/through whom the insolence of the evil spirits is undone"),[342] if of course, it was not originally written for the feast of the Sunday of Pentecost. The inferior character of this feast/synaxis is also apparent from the provision for combining its service with the service of the saint who happens to be celebrated, according to the strict implementation of the Typikon. Thus, years ago, the Monday after Pentecost coincided with the Third Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner (May 25) and this strange combination of the services took place despite the fact that the feast of the Holy Spirit has already come to be considered as a feast of the Holy Trinity. However, this would not have ever happened if the Sunday of Pentecost coincided with May 25, on account of the importance of the main day of the feast of the Lord. In order to complete the illustration of the festal calendar character of the feast of the Holy Spirit, let it be noted that, of the readings of the Liturgy, only the epistle reading came be considered as related to it (Ephesians 5:8–10, where a reference to the Holy Spirit occurs twice), while the gospel pericope (Matthew 18:10–20) was probably selected since it refers to the subject of Monday as an uncommemorated day of the week ("their angels," Matthew 18:10).[343]

342. "Πᾶσα πνοή, δόξαζε Πνεῦμα Κυρίου,/δι' οὗ πονηρῶν πνευμάτων φροῦδα θράση."

343. Monday is a standard day for the commemoration of the angels.

From what we have seen up until now, it can be concluded that the Monday after Pentecost was introduced as a secondary feast or as a synaxis in honor of the Holy Spirit and so it remains on our festal calendar and in our liturgical books up until nowadays. Now, how did it come to be considered a feast of the Holy Trinity and for temples that are honored by its name to celebrate on this day? The subject is interesting and has need of special research because from what I know it has not been studied, at least in terms of the practice of the Orthodox Church. Neither do I know any place where, at least officially, it is characterized as a feast of the Holy Trinity. In any case, this must be something very modern. Nor—fortunately—has anyone attempted to compose a special service for its celebration. The only exception that appears to exist is a canon of the monk Agapios of Crete in his book *Trinitarian Oktōēchos*, which was published in Venice in 1656.[344] There, apart from the canons according to the eight tones in honor of the Holy Trinity, which are prescribed to be chanted in its temples in Saturday Matins, there is also a canon chanted on the Monday of the Holy Spirit—for the Holy Trinity. Is this about a deficiency of our Heortologion and the hymnography of the Church, which was at one time pointed out and was at first quietly and afterwards more visibly remedied with the establishment of temples, the renaming of the feast of the Holy Spirit to the feast of the Holy Trinity, and the be it faint-hearted attempt for the introduction of special hymnography for it? Probably not. The original thought is obvious which was that all temples and all feasts are temples and feasts of the Holy Trinity—of our trinitarian God.

344. Ἀγάπιος ὁ Λάνδος, *Τριαδικὴ ὀκτώηχος ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶ γεγραμμένοι κανόνες κδ'. οἱ μὲν ὀκτὼ πρὸς τὴν παναγίαν Τριάδα, Πατέρα, Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Ὧν οἱ μὲν εἰσὶ ποίημα Ἀγαπίου Μοναχοῦ, οἱ δὲ ἑτέρων παλαιῶν διδασκάλων καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διορθωθέντες καὶ τυπωθέντες οἰκείοις αὐτοῦ ἀναλώμασιν εἰς κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν* (Venice: Παρὰ Ἀνδρέᾳ τῷ Ἰουλλιανῷ, 1656). Agapios (d. ca. 1664–1671), was born in Crete as Athanasios Landos (Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Λάνδος), was tonsured as a monk taking the name Agapios, lived on the Holy Mountain, and produced medical, hagiographical, liturgical, and spiritual works that were published in Venice (Στυλιανὸς Παπαδόπουλος, "Ἀγάπιος. Ὁ Λάνδος," ΘΗΕ 1:152–154). Additional bibliography is listed in Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft 1453–1821* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 67.

Subsequently, by dedicating a special temple and a special feast for God in Trinity you are differentiating according to a logical progression this temple and this feast from the other temples and the other feasts so that (never may that come to pass!) they are not temples and feasts of God, the Holy Trinity. In any case, while it appears that during modern times the dedication of temples in honor of the Holy Trinity has generally become prevalent, popular piety remained attached to the oldest terminology. It is well known that in many places the temples of the Holy Trinity are commonly called "Holy Spirit" (Ἅγιο Πνεῦμα)[345] by the people. And this is not completely without significance.

Regarding the West, the subject has been studied and we know the historical course that it followed. In Northern Gaul, temples first began to be built in honor of the Holy Trinity and they celebrated a special feast for it on the Sunday after Pentecost or on the last Sunday of the ecclesiastical year. Liturgies were also written in its honor, to the extent that the liturgical forms of the West, with special interchangeable prayers, have the ability to adapt the Liturgy to the subject of the feast in question being celebrated, of the Holy Trinity. During the twelfth century, this liturgical piety was widespread in Gaul, Germany, the Low Countries, and Britain. Despite the intervention of Pope Alexander III (d. 1181), who faithful to the ancient Roman tradition reacted and disapproved it, the feast became prevalent almost everywhere in the West. Finally, Pope John XXII recognized it in 1334 as a universal feast and recorded it on the Roman Calendar of Feasts on the Sunday after Pentecost. Everything that happened in the West cannot be irrelevant to the practice of the East, and conversely. They take place during nearly the same period and are associated with the feast of Pentecost. However, only special research can clarify these matters.

345. The term is used in its standard modern Greek form without the addition of "ν" to "Ἅγιον."

521

In the prayer of the prothesis, when the priest says, "bless this prothesis...,"[346] does he bless the precious gifts with his hand or not?

Nowadays, as far as anyone can know, it has probably become generally prevalent for the priest not to bless the precious gifts when he says the phrase above in the prayer of the prothesis, "O God, our God...."[347] The old-time priests followed different traditions, not from ignorance or custom, but affirming that they so received it and thus it had to be done. Some blessed and others did not bless. It appears that this is about an old variation, as at least the sources show. The standard rubrics in the liturgical texts or in the *Diataxis* of Patriarch Philotheos do not make mention regarding a blessing, but this means absolutely nothing. Neither at the "Peace be to all"[348] nor at other blessings indisputably given by the hand of the priest, nor often at the very invocation of the Holy Spirit, is the time and manner of the blessing prescribed. However, it is indisputable that these similar phrases of blessing were also accompanied with a crosswise motion of the priest's hand. And in the case in question, this clearly concerns a prayer of blessing for the gifts of the prothesis. Consistent with an analogy to other parallel instances, it must be considered as self-evident that the crosswise blessing of the priest also originally accompanied the words of blessing. How, now, did the issue arise regarding whether the gifts must be blessed at that moment and this strange solution was given for the words of blessing to be said but the blessing with the hand not to be given? With the evidence that we gathered, we will attempt to untangle this complex matter.

The first relevant witness is found in the twelfth canon of Saint Nikēphoros, patriarch of Constantinople (806–815). These are a series of thirty-six or thirty-seven canons that were not confirmed by any council, which are associated with a multitude of problems.

346. "εὐλόγησον τὴν πρόθεσιν ταύτην..."
347. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."
348. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι."

Not only are their author and the time of their composition uncertain, but also their very title ("Of our father among the saints Nikēphoros... from his ecclesiastical works and the holy fathers with him...)[349] and their text itself are problematic. Blessed Nikodēmos published them in the *Rudder* as he found them "in certain manuscript books of the venerable monasteries of the Holy Mountain," translating them "into simple language."[350] However, there are also modern editions of the original text and its translation.[351] But in any case, these so-called canons of Saint Nikēphoros represent a certain Constantinopolitan tradition and attempt to codify it and, more importantly, influence later commentators, at least on the subject referred to.

Consequently, canon twelve of Saint Nikēphoros is the following according to the original text: "That it is not necessary to make a seal over the holy chalice in the prayer of the skeuophylakion" (Ὅτι οὐ χρὴ σφραγίδα ποιεῖν ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου ἐπὶ τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον).[352] The translated text into modern Greek, which is published in the *Rudder*, is nearly the same: "The priest must not make a seal for the holy chalice in the prayer of the skeuophylakion" (Δὲν πρέπει ὁ ἱερεὺς νὰ κάμνῃ σφραγίδα εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου).[353] The text of the canon has a vagueness that is capable of two interpretations. If a blessing (seal) is done to the holy chalice, then it concerns the blessing of the union ("Blessed is the union of your holy things...")[354] after the pouring of wine and water into it. However, the phrase "in the prayer of the skeuophylakion"[355] must then be understood in a more general sense, as

349. "Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Νικηφόρου... ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν αὐτοῦ Συντάξεων καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἁγίων πατέρων..."

350. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 726–731, 727 n. 1.

351. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:427–431; PG 100:855a–860c.

352. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:428; PG 100:856c.

353. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 727.

354. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἕνωσις τῶν ἁγίων σου..."

355. "ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου."

identical with the service of the prothesis in general, which is rather unlikely. Actually, "prayer of the skeuophylakion"[356] or "prayer in the skeuophylakion"[357] is more customarily named "prayer while consuming the Holy Elements in the skeuophylakion" (so-called),[358] namely, the last prayer of the Divine Liturgy ("You who yourself are the fulfillment of the law...,"[359] or "The mystery of your dispensation, O Christ our God, has been accomplished and perfected..."[360] or "O Lord our God, who brought us..."[361] of the Liturgies of Chrysostomos, Basileios, and the Presanctified Gifts respectively). However, it does not mean this here, but the "prayer of the prothesis,"[362] common to the two Byzantine Liturgies, "O God, our God, who did send forth the heavenly bread...,"[363] which sometimes is entitled, "Prayer [of the prothesis] which the priest does in the skeuophylakion when the bread is placed on the paten,"[364] according to the most ancient taxis.

Despite the vagueness that we already noted, the prohibition of a blessing must be referring to the prayer of the prothesis and especially to the phrase that is noted in the question. The phrase was also so understood by Saint Nikodēmos, who in a footnote to the controversial canon refers in his commentary to canon twenty-one of the Council in Laodicea.[365] In a footnote to this

356. "εὐχὴ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου."
357. "εὐχὴ ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ."
358. "εὐχὴ ἐν τῷ συστεῖλαι τὰ ἅγια [λεγομένη] ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ."
359. "Τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου..."
360. "Ἥνυσται καὶ τετέλεσται..."
361. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀγαγών ἡμᾶς..."
362. "εὐχὴ τῆς προθέσεως."
363. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον..."
364. "Εὐχὴ [τῆς προθέσεως] ἣν ποιεῖ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ ἀποτιθεμένου τοῦ ἄρτου ἐν τῷ δίσκῳ."
365. Ἀγάπιος Ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 727 n. 5.

canon, he is concerned regarding the place of the deacon and the prothesis, and refers to "canon twelve of Saint Nikēphoros, who prohibits a seal to be done in the prayer of the skeuophylakion for the holy chalice, namely, for the priest not to bless the precious gifts in the prothesis with his hand, when he says the prayer of [the] prothesis.[366] See also Iōannēs Nathanaël the Oikonomos in his explanation of the Divine Liturgy (chapter 17, p. 11)."[367] We could not examine the explanation of Nathanaël. It is not clear from the text of Nikodēmos whether he refers to him regarding the subject of the blessing or regarding the location of the diakonikon/prothesis, as is most likely.[368] In any case, the ones who are dealing with the subject of the blessing or not of the gifts during the prothesis, are simply citing the witness of Nikēphoros, without justifying like him, the reason for

366. The use of the brackets indicates the absence of the word "τῆς" in the text quoted from the Saint Nikodēmos.

367. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 429 n. 1. The full reference for the work referenced by Nikodēmos is Ἰωάννης Ναθαναήλ, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία μετὰ ἐξηγήσεων διαφόρων διδασκάλων, ἅσπερ μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γλῶτταν* (Venice: Iacomo Leoncini, 1574). Iōannēs Nathanaël held the office of great oikonomos and lived during the last half of the sixteenth century. For a short biography, see Κωνσταντῖνος Σάθας, *Νεοελληνικὴ Φιλολογία: Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων, ἀπὸ τῆς κατάλύσεως τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἐθνεγερσίας (1453–1821)* (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκ τῆς τυπογραφίας τῶν τέκνων Ἀνδρέου Κορομηλά, 1868), 231. A more extensive discussion of Nathanaël and his work is found in Παναγιώτης Σκαλτσῆς, *"Ἡ Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία κατὰ τὴν Τουρκοκρατία," ΙΒ' Λειτουργικὸ Συμπόσιο Στελεχῶν Ἱερῶν Μητροπόλεων* (http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/commitees/liturgical/ib_skaltsis_tourk.pdf, accessed September 16, 2021).

368. The chapter and page in the explanation of Nathanaël referenced by Nikodēmos do not refer to a prohibition of a blessing for the gifts but are related to a general discussion of the prothesis and associated symbolisms.

which they are not blessing the gifts. This is how Iōannēs of Kitros[369] and the "Cypriot nomima"[370] simply put it.

A later, quite remarkable book of the sacred teacher (ἱεροδιδάσκαλος) Daniēl Geōrgopoulos of Zygovisti of Arcadia, which was published in 1833 for the first time in Venice and for the fifth time in Athens in 1898, with the title, *Sacred Anthology*, when commenting on what is celebrated in the sacred prothesis, also refers to our subject.[371] He first makes mention regarding the blessing of

369. Phountoulēs does not provide a specific reference. Iōannēs of Kitros is attributed a series of canonical answers dated generally in the thirteenth century. Their authorship is disputed by modern scholarship with some ascribing them to Dēmētrios Chomatēnos of Ohrid (d. ca. 1236). In any case, the questions and answers were regarded by late Byzantine canonists as an authentic work of Iōannēs of Kitros. These canonical responses were incorporated by the hieromonk Matthaios Blastarēs (ca. 1335) as an appendix to his collection, and cited by the fifteenth century canonist, Iōasaph of Ephesos (d. 1437), in his own canonical responses. As Phountoulēs states below, in the fifth response, Iōasaph states that Iōannēs of Kitros forbids the blessing. However, none of the canonical answers attributed to Iōannēs of Kitros state this. For examples of the modern scholarly debate concerning Iōannēs of Kitros, see Jean Darrouzès, "Les reponses canonique de Jean de Kitros," *Revue des études byzantines* 31(1973): 319–334 and Dieter Simon, "Fragen an Johannes von Kitros," in *Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν Νίκο Σβορῶνο*, ed. Βασίλης Κρεμμύδας, Χρύσα Μαλτέζου, Νικόλαος Μ. Παναγιωτάκης (Ρέθυμνο; Πανεπιστημιακὲς Ἐκδόσεις Κρήτης, 1986), 1: 258–279.

370. The "Cypriot nomima" (Κυπριακὰ νόμιμα) were a form of nomokanon used by hierarchs as a canonical reference work in the post-Byzantine period, see M.N. Χριστοδούλος, "Κυπριακαὶ Κανονικαὶ Διατάξεις," *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Κέντρου Ἐπιστημονικῶν Ἐρευνῶν*, 12 (1983): 329–490 and Θ. Παπαδόπουλλος, "Κυπριακὰ Νόμιμα," *Μελέται καὶ Ὑπομνήματα* 1 (1984): 1–142. Phountoulēs does not provide a specific reference to one of these nomokanons.

371. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed., Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 24–26. In describing the Liturgy, the book has two columns, one in which the Liturgy is summarized and another in which commentary is provided. Daniēl Geōrgopoulos (Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος) was born in Zygovisti, a village in western Arcadia, lived in the first half of nineteenth century, and was a scholar, teacher, and preacher. He actively participated in the Greek Revolution and was appointed "sacred preacher" (ἱεροκῆρυξ) by the Holy Synod of Greece. The title referenced can be translated as, *Sacred Anthology: containing an explanation on the celebration of the seven mysteries of the Orthodox Church as well as various useful and necessary information for guiding the holy*

the chalice: "And he blesses this union of the wine and water crosswise, while saying, 'Blessed is the union of your holy things.'"[372] And he comments: "Through the blessing, he dedicates these things to God."[373] Afterwards, he speaks regarding the particles, the covering of the gifts, the censing, and the prayer of the prothesis. He characteristically says here: "And he does the dismissal" (Καὶ ποιεῖ ἀπόλυσιν).[374] And he comments: "According to canon twelve of Nikolaos the Confessor"[375] (obviously he means Nikēphoros).

In the absence of other known evidence, the writings of Daniël can guide us to an answer to the question regarding what reason the canon bearing the name of Nikēphoros, to whom the same one also refers, as we saw, prohibits the blessing. Daniël either found it somewhere or expresses his own hypothesis. The first blessing upon the chalice is considered dedicatory of the gifts, in some manner also common for both elements. Consequently, the second blessing is superfluous ("without him blessing further").[376] There exists weak support for this hypothesis in the phrase of the canon: "over the holy chalice."[377] It can be considered as some implied connection between the two blessings. The first relates to the chalice (alone), the second (to the bread and) to the chalice. However, the one does not preclude the other, nor can the first blessing (it is abundantly clear) be considered as being dedicatory to both species.

---

clergy. This discussion of his life and work is based on Φώτιος Χρυσανθόπουλος, *Βίοι Πελοποννησίων Ἀνδρῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Π.Δ. Σακελλάριος, 1888), 314, and Πολύκαρπος (Συνοδινός), "Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος," *Θεολογία* 8 (1930): 72–78.

372. "Καὶ εὐλογεῖ σταυροειδῶς τὴν ἕνωσιν ταύτην τοῦ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, λέγων· Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἕνωσις τῶν Ἁγίων σου."

373. "Διὰ τῆς Εὐλογίας ἀφιερώνει αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν Θεόν."

374. The full text reads, "Καὶ θυμιάσας τὴν Πρόθεσιν τῶν τιμίων Δώρων, λέγει· 'Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός, κτλ.' Καὶ εἰπὼν τὴν Εὐχὴν τῆς Προθέσεως χωρὶς νὰ εὐλογήσῃ πλέον, ποιεῖ Ἀπόλυσιν, 'Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός (ἢ ὁ ἀναστάς),' καὶ ἀναχωρεῖ ἀπὸ τὴν Προσκομιδήν" (And censing the Prothesis of the precious gifts, he says: 'Blessed is our God, and so forth.' And saying the Prayer of the Prothesis without him blessing further, he does a dismissal, 'May Christ our true [or 'May He who rose from the dead...'] and departs from the Proskomidē").

375. "Κατὰ τὸν ιβ' κανόνα. Νικολάου τοῦ ὁμολογητοῦ."

376. "χωρὶς νὰ εὐλογήσῃ πλέον."

377. "ἐπὶ τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον."

One other interpretation could be a sort of empty fear of a misunderstanding of the blessing during the prayer of the prothesis as being a consecratory blessing, as a sort of obviation of the blessing during the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the key point of the prayer of the anaphora. Perhaps this is the most probable one, but also the one incorrect. Moreover, why not also consider open to misunderstanding the blessing of the chalice after the union of wine and water in the prothesis? We have blessings in a variety of forms in our liturgical tradition, in loaves, in wine, in water, in oils, both in animate and inanimate elements. All these are blessed with a word of prayer and with a crosswise seal by the hand of the priest. It would be unreasonable for us to foresee possibilities for confusion or misunderstanding everywhere. Particularly in the Holy Eucharist, in many liturgical forms we have witnessed blessings of gifts prior to the final invocation of the Holy Spirit and the blessing that accompanies it for the change of the eucharistic species into the Body and Blood of Christ, even a kind of preinvocation.

The gifts of the Holy Eucharist already from the service of the prothesis have been offered to God by the Church and are blessed, "precious," "holy," "divine," "antitypes" of the Body and Blood of the Lord up until they are changed by the consecration, by the grace and energy of the Holy Spirit and the invocatory word and the seal—of blessing—of the priest, into the Body and Blood of the Master. For this reason, also prior to their consecration, they are honored, censed, venerated as holy things and "antitypes," as we said, of the Body and Blood of Christ. Thus, whether they are blessed during "bless this prothesis" becomes an almost insignificant detail and in any case leaves the impression of an inconsistency. The word of blessing is said anyway, always in an indirect and inconspicuous manner, as in all the blessings that are given with extreme priestly humility in Orthodox liturgical practice and tradition ("O God have compassion on us...,"[378] "The servant of God [name] is

378. "Ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς..."

baptized..."[379] "The servant of God [name] is crowned...,"[380] "May the blessing... of the Lord...come upon you...,"[381] and the like).

Even the existence alone of this canon shows that a blessing was given with the hand of the priest during the prayer of the prothesis, or at least both practices existed in parallel, and the author of the canon favors the one. It is a little implausible that he is introducing anything new.

We did not also examine the opposing view—because it also exists. We left it for the end. This is about the answer to the fifth question to Iōasaph of Ephesos (d. 1437). They asked him, "Whether the priest who says the prayer, 'God our God, who did send forth the heavenly bread...' ought to bless the prothesis?'" And he answers: "And the one of Kitros forbids this, but the Great Church [of Christ] does this daily, for which reason you should also do likewise."[382]

522

It is said and written that monastery worship constitutes a model for worship in parishes. Is it possible to ever apply the monastic Typikon to parishes in its full form? Then by what logic can it be considered as a model?

Many times, we tangentially touched on this subject in connection with various related questions. However, we avoided certitudes as well as the characterization of monastic worship as "a model" for the practice of parish temples. The term is very weighty and can

379. "Βαπτίζεται..." The Greek word, δεῖνα (so-and-so), is often parenthetically inserted as a placeholder in prayers and petitions where specific name(s) can be inserted. In the present translation, the word "name" has been used to translate this word.

380. "Στέφεται..."

381. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου...ἔλθοι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς..."

382. Ἀλέξανδρος Κορακίδης, ed., *Ἰωάσαφ Ἐφέσου (1437) (Ἰωάννης Βλαδύντερος): Βίος - Ἔργα – Διδασκαλία* (Ἀθῆναι: Νεκτάριος Δ. Παναγόπουλος, 1992), 216, where the editor states that no known canonical answer of Iōannēs of Kitros addresses this point; compare also Γεννάδιος Ἀραμπατζόγλου, *Φωτίειος Βιβλιοθήκη* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: Φαζελέτ, 1935), 2:241. For a brief study of the canonical responses of Iōasaph of Ephesos, see Patrick Viscuso, "Vampires, Not Mothers: The Living Dead in the Canonical Responses of Ioasaph of Ephesos," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 44 (2000): 169–179.

lead to impasses, which are already implied in the second part of the question. Monastic worship is a fruit of the tradition of the sacred monasteries, which has not been imposed "from above," but has been formed through the centuries within monastic communities based on the special presuppositions and conditions of the monastic way of life. Namely, the fathers who constitute the monastic brotherhood comprise a singular, ideal body of faithful, with special requirements, but also special capabilities. In the first place, they are mature persons, intensely religious, given that they voluntarily and consciously chose this complete form of life in Christ, have intense devotional concerns, come to know and advance continuously in knowledge of worship practice with constant experience, and actively participate in it. In addition, there are also practical reasons, the usually small size of monastic brotherhoods, the relatively small dimensions of temples of monasteries, the fact that they reside within the monastery and around the temple, and the fact that they do not have family obligations and duties as well as professional commitments. They chose "the good portion" of Mary (Luke 10:42) and consistently follow it. It stands to reason that the program of worship for monasteries is especially rich both in terms of content and length. It is not necessary for us to describe the living conditions of the inhabitants of cities and villages and to point out commonly known matters, which relate to the composition of the congregation of parishes. Moreover, for this reason, the monasteries were created by faithful who were uncompromising towards common standards.

For all these reasons, it was very natural for the liturgical Typikon that was born and formed in the parishes to be different from the monastic one. However, historical reasons led to the prevalence of the Typikon of the monasteries also in the parish temples. During the end of the Byzantine period, according to the witness of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the Divine Liturgy alone of the regular services remained celebrated according to the parish/"asmatic" Typikon in the monasteries and in the parish temples, while the old parish rite was only preserved by exception in Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki

and in certain other temples. During the Tourkokratia,[383] the monastic Typikon also became completely prevalent in the parishes. Naturally by unavoidable necessity, the services were limited both in numbers and in terms of length. Still others were moved from their original place to times more appropriate for the faithful. Thus, the kathismata of the Psalter were not read, the intermediate verses of the psalms of Lamp-lighting and lauds, the readings, and the stichologia of the odes were omitted, the canons began to be abbreviated, vigils were not celebrated, and the Midnight Office, the Hours, and Complines were either omitted or were celebrated in groups at convenient times. However, there were also other equally important changes, but not so apparent at first glance. The simple people could no longer participate in chanting either in common or even alternating,[384] as in the monasteries, nor did they have the capability to bear and understand all this enormous liturgical, and especially hymnological, richness. Certain impressive and more popular elements of the services were emphasized and the strong penitential and plain character that distinguished the monastic worship practice declined.

And nowadays, while in theory the Typikon of the monasteries and the parishes is the same, all these differences, internal and external, continue and will never cease for the reasons above to differentiate the Typikon of the parishes from the Typikon of the monasteries. Some of them have been formalized with the modern Typika, others are done out of habit or ad hoc, when misinterpreting the sorely tried rubric, "as it seems good to the presider."[385] And while the Typika, and these *Calendar-Typika*,[386] which are annually published, appear as if they are ignoring the problem and the often commonly applied solutions, it appears that the practice found some relative balance, despite more conservative or liberal aberrations. We saw examples of such disputable cases in various older questions, such as for example those that relate to the reading of the kathismata

383. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

384. Namely, antiphonal chanting.

385. "ὡς δόξῃ τῷ προεστῶτι."

386. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

of the Psalter, the stichologia of the odes, the omission of the verses for "Lord, I have cried to you..."[387] and for lauds, the transfer of the eōthinon gospel reading of Sundays, the reading of the Hours, and so forth.

By logical necessity, as long as the monastic Typikon applies in the parishes and as long as it is applied abridged or modified by oikonomia due to the particular needs and conditions of the secular Church and as long as strictness is observed in the monasteries, it is self-evident that the monastic practice constitutes the ideal form of worship, which the parishes imitate.[388] However, it is equally self-evident that this imitation or quest for strictness according to the model of the monasteries can lead to excesses and impasses. For example, it is not possible for the institution of the vigil so beloved in the monastic tradition during the great feasts to find ground in the practice of the parishes, nor even if it is exceptionally celebrated, to have the great duration and typical perfection of the vigils of the monasteries. It is not possible for the Psalters or odes to be recited with stichologia, or for the Midnight Office and Matins to begin at almost midnight, and for the services of the daily cycle to last almost eight hours daily. Despite all these things, the parish temples, in some manner, function especially during Great Lent, (due to the conservatism of the period)[389] like katholika of monasteries, and the people are called to participate voluntarily and according to ability in the developed monastic service. This manner of approach to the strictness of monastic worship could be compared to the implementation in practice of another similar institution, fasting. As is

387. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ..."

388. In another study, Phountoulēs explains his use of ἀκρίβεια and οἰκονομία in their canonical sense as "strictness" and "oikonomia," when discussing the topic of the Typikon for monasteries and parish: "The apparent only difference of the Typikon of monasteries from the Typikon of parishes nowadays consists in the observance 'according to strictness' or 'according to oikonomia' (in order for us to use these two canonical terms by analogy) of the rubrics of the Typikon, common both for the monastics and for those in the world," Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Τελετουργικὰ Θέματα*, 2nd edition (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 2009), 1:12.

389. In other words, the liturgical practices of Great Lent retain many ancient elements.

well known, the same canons for fasting and its relaxation apply for monastics and those in the world.[390] But while the monastics, who are assisted by the entire regulation of their life, maintain strictness, those in the world, pressed by their family and living requirements, maintain what is possible and in accordance with their own propensity, while always aiming to approach the monastic practice. Thus, while the monks do not eat meat, eat once-a-day, do not consume oil and wine during the days of fasting, eat after the Ninth Hour, or even remain without food during certain days, the Christians in the world either do not observe or partially observe all these things, leaving the remaining matters to God's mercy and to the discretion of the spiritual father.

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, an excellent judge of strictness, but also a good shepherd, encounters the problem of the prevalence of the monastic liturgical Typikon in the parishes, while on the one hand recognizing the cuts already existing in his era as necessary, such as the omission of the stichologia of the Psalter, but on the other hand emphasizing the special place of the priest/ephēmerios of parishes, as not only praying for, but also praying in place of the people. Namely, he makes up for the deficiencies and ignorance of the people, when he maintains the standards of the monastic Typikon in the temple, even if de facto the pious people cannot participate in the service or take part as much as possible. This tactic was initially applied, and is still applied, in parishes, particularly during the Tourkokratia, where secular priests learned by experience to celebrate the matters of worship in the monasteries, which served as schools for training of clergymen. In modern times, this fell into disuse either due to the decline of monasteries or due to the liturgical education that is given by special schools for the instruction of sacred clergy, which more or less does not imitate monastic models nor project the monastic practice as ideals for worship.

Despite this, and perhaps as a response to some latent trend for secularization of the practice of parishes, a countervailing trend for

390. However, as bearers of the "angelic schēma," the monastic practice is to add Mondays as an additional day of weekly fasting—a day on which the angels are commemorated.

a reappraisal of the value of the monastic liturgical tradition and its imitation in parish temples is observed during the last few decades, especially among young persons. The noted recent flowering of monastic life that also entails the commensurate flourishing of monastic worship obviously contributed to this. With the improvement of the means of communication, the monasteries nowadays attract a multitude of pilgrims, clergy and lay, who are naturally impressed by the strictness and the modesty of the monastic Typikon and attempt to imitate it. It is likewise a fact that the spiritual growth[391] of our people and the saturation by the abundance of the supply of various artistic and cultural goods, would lead to the search for more authentic forms also in liturgical practice, less ostentatious, more modest and solemn, stricter and more traditional in the true meaning of the term. They find what they are looking for in the monasteries, more than in the parishes, where many times the temptation of a supposed renewal leads to alterations of the taxis, ostentatious rites, the use of inordinate lighting or deafening and disruptive sound, a piling up of sacred utensils of barbaric taste, languid or secularized chanting, and the like.

For all these reasons, one cannot look other than with sympathy and hope at the emergence of monastic worship as a model for parish liturgical practice. Not so much in terms of the completeness and strictness of the Typikon, because this is never possible in the context of parish reality. But mainly in terms of precise knowledge, respect for tradition, and especially in terms of the sacred ethos of Orthodox worship, which is not identical with the "Byzantine grandeur" that is always projected as an ideal. The model for imitation does not so much concern the quantity of the chanting as it does its quality.

391. The term "πνευματικὴ ἀνάπτυξη," which is translated here as "spiritual growth," is not necessarily referring to religious spirituality, but rather a cultural awakening and an emergence from cultural oppression, particularly under the Tourkokratia, namely, Ottoman rule.

523

It is asked why requisite agreement between the Greek and the Slavic churches does not exist in practice regarding readings of the Divine Liturgy, while the liturgical books that contain the readings are the same and while the same rubrics of the Typikon apply that prescribe the cycle of pericopes.

The fact that between the Greek and Slavic liturgical taxis there exist differences, which are chiefly owed to the more ancient tradition of the Slavic churches, but also in the interim to different development on many points, is not something that must be considered from the start as unnatural and unpermitted. The liturgical life of the Church always knew and knows a relative variety of forms within the framework of the common tradition. These reveal the variety and diversity of gifts, and fashion agreement in the Holy Spirit to the glorification of God. Not only during the early period, but also nowadays, and not only among different language groups within the same liturgical form, but also within the same geographical region and in the same liturgical language, legitimate and respectable differences of Typikon do exist according to place and time. We will not refer to the early Byzantine parish services of the daily cycle that were different from and applied in parallel to their contemporary monastic services. Nor to the differences that individual manuscripts present in the services of the sacred mysteries or the Typika of various monasteries among themselves. It suffices for us to recall only the differences that exist among the various Typika of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, namely, in the same contemporary monastic community, as well as the local differences at different points of the liturgical practice of parishes within the contemporary Greek nation, many of which we pointed out and commented on in past and recent answers. Of course, needless to say, these variations are legitimate as long as they relate to the details of liturgical taxis and not to major points of the taxis and when they do not originate from errors or misunderstandings of old liturgical rubrics.

The formation of the system of readings followed generally a similar course as the liturgical taxis. From the free choice of pericopes,

it was to be expected to pass to the consolidation of a prescribed taxis, and for the reading of Holy Scripture during the synaxes to be done based on a predetermined plan. Thus, systems for reading Holy Scripture formed in some places, which looked alike, but also which differed among themselves. We have already been given the opportunity to refer to the Jerusalemite/Georgian Kanonarion of the seventh century and we occasionally saw similarities and differences of the early practice of Jerusalem with the contemporary one. The churches of Egypt, Asia Minor, the West, and so forth also had similar systems of pericopes without these causing problems among the churches, nor the dominance and imposition of one system over another being sought. And again, we encountered differences between older and newer practice; changes, transfers, or replacements of pericopes, which we cannot always nowadays know the reasons for which they were done and the time or place that they took place. If nowadays in the Orthodox Church we have a common system of readings, this is not owed to theoretical reasons that imposed it, but purely to historical circumstances, namely, to the decline and gradual abandonment of the liturgical forms of the Orthodox centers of the East and the prevalence of the liturgical taxis of Constantinople. The liturgical traditions, which were encountered and recast in this great ecclesiastical center, nowadays constitute the common tradition and taxis of the Orthodox Churches of the ecumene.

Namely, for the readings of Holy Scripture, a common program nowadays applies to the entire Orthodox Church. And this is something very important. The readings that are read in our church synaxes constitute together with the celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist two poles around which the life of the Orthodox Church is turning. Namely, the readings are not a secondary element, but on the contrary constitute a primary element, since they constitute, we would say, the "syllabus" of teaching, of the source of preaching and catechesis, even of the Heortologion and hymnography, of the spiritual feeding of God's people. And for this reason, the pursuit of unity also on this point of the liturgical and didactic practice of the Orthodox Church is definitely desirable, if not imperative.

The question that arises from the query above is very simple and clear: Is the system of pericopes common, as reflected in our liturgical books—the Gospel book and Apostolos?

As is well known, the Slavonic books consist of a translation from the Greek Eklogadia.[392] The standard rubrics are the same that prescribe the cycle of pericopes during the reading in Church. Therefore, how is it justified for the same pericopes not to be read in the Greek and Slavic churches on the same Sunday, so that the unity desired and necessitated by the indisputable positions above is broken? This may not be apparent if there is a geographical distance between Greek-speaking and Slavic-speaking communities, which is also common. However, in cases of their geographic coexistence, which is not completely unusual, the difference is very noticeable. But in any case, it is a sign of some anomaly or error in the practice of the common system.

Indeed, a systematic comparison of the applied Typikon, as presented in the *Calendar-Typika*, which the Church of Greece and the Church of Russia annually publish, shows that the above question is not without real subject matter.[393] There certainly exists an agreement in most instances, as was predictable. However, there also exist quite a few differences. We tried to identify and explain them by groups. We limited ourselves to the Sunday readings both because theoretically and practically they are the ones most interesting and because also these alone provide, as I believe, a clear picture of the whole subject, naturally, within the framework of possibilities and limits that these "Answers" operate. We based ourselves upon the *Calendar-Typika* of the two churches above as the most representative, of the last decade, and we also used supplementary calendars of other churches, which note the Sunday readings.

1. The Slavic tradition remained faithful to the ancient system of combined readings of pericopes for Sundays and a celebrated saint.

392. An Eklogadion (ἐκλογάδιον) is a lectionary of epistle and gospel readings.

393. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος); Богослужебные указания (Moscow: The Publishing house of the Moscow Patriarchate).

Thus, on Sundays where the epistle reading of the celebrated saint prevails or, more rarely, even his/her gospel reading according to the modern Typikon, four pericopes are read according to the most ancient taxis. The Sunday pericopes are never omitted unless it is a feast of the Lord. We wrote about this system of double readings in the answer to question number 433.

2. For the same reason, the gospel pericope of the Fourth Sunday of Luke (the parable of the Sower) is not transferred in order for the Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (October 11–17) to be said. On this day, the pericope, Matthew 5:14–19,[394] "You are the salt of the earth...," is read, after the gospel of the sequential Sunday. Note that the same pericope is provided for by the Typikon of Saint Sophia of the ninth century for the commemoration of the Holy Fathers (October 11), which at that time was still transferred to a Sunday.[395] But also, the printed Gospel books, which know the transfer of the commemoration of the Holy Fathers to Sunday, cite the pericope of Matthew above with the note that it is read, "after the one noted in the kanonia of today's Sunday, also the following gospel reading," namely, Matthew 5:14–19. Obviously, the change took place later when the reading of only one gospel became prevalent. In the publication of the Apostolikē Diakonia in the medium size, the standard rubric is adapted to the new reality and the beginning of the pericope of the Sower is quoted.[396] The practice of the Slavic churches is obviously more correct and more consistent with the ancient taxis, of course provided that two pericopes are read.

3. Obviously owed to the same reason is the combined reading of the final Sunday epistles/gospels of the sequence of Matthew to-

394. Namely, the reading for the Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council.

395. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:66–67. See also question 179 for a discussion of the readings on October 11.

396. Phountoulēs is referring to the publication of a Gospel book by the Apostolikē Diakonia ("in the medium size") which contains only Matthew 5:14–19 as the reading for the Sunday in question. The publication contains only the start of the reading and most likely contains a reference to the page that has the entire text on another day.

gether with the pericopes of the Sunday prior to and after the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, as well as the final or nearly final epistles/gospels of the sequence of Luke together with the pericopes prior to and after the Nativity of Christ and prior to and after the feast of Lights. The combined reading is not observed in instances where Pascha is early, and the pericopes of Matthew are not sufficient for the period up until the Sunday after the Exaltation as well as in the opposite instance when Pascha is late, when the pericopes of Luke are not sufficient for coverage of the gap between the feast of Lights and the beginning of the Triōdion. As appropriate, the forefeast and afterfeast pericopes alone are then read. Conversely, in the Greek Kyriakodromia,[397] which are based on the principle of not combining the reading of the pericopes, Matthew is interrupted on the Sunday that precedes the Sunday prior to the Exaltation and the remaining pericopes are not considered expended but are used for coverage of the gaps between the feast of Lights and the Triōdion if Luke does not suffice. The pericopes of Luke, which are salvaged from them not being read on the Sundays prior to and after the feast of Lights, prove to be useful for covering the same gaps, which after the implementation of the Gregorian Calendar, are numerous.

4. The Fifth Sunday of Luke (of the rich man and Lazarus) is not transferred for another reason. Just as we saw in question number 179, the transfer of this pericope is attested to already by the referenced Typikon of the Great Church from the ninth century and is owed to the commemoration of the "ash," "balsam," or "dust" in Constantinople from the eruption of Vesuvius on November 6, 472.[398] Perhaps the Fifth of Luke was originally transferred only in

397. Κυριακοδρόμιον, τό (pl. Κυριακοδρόμια, τά). Kyriakodromion (pl. Kyriakodromia). This term can designate a book containing the cycle of gospel and epistle readings for Sundays and pertinent homilies, or the cycle of Sunday gospel and epistle readings in general.

398. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:90–91. For a discussion of volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and their effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536

Constantinople since the remembrance of that sign from God only concerned the latter. Namely, it had a local character and later influenced the practice of eparchies dependent on Constantinople, but not also the Slavic churches.

5. Of the two Sundays of Luke, the Tenth and Eleventh (which according to the Greek Kyriakodromia precede the Nativity and, while the Eleventh is read on the Sunday of the Forefathers, the Tenth on the Sunday prior to this one), only the Eleventh is transferred to the Sunday of the Forefathers, while the other, the Tenth, is read in its sequence. This obviously is owed to the fact that the Slavonic tradition also here follows the relatively older tradition that provided for only two forefeast Sundays for the Nativity (of the Forefathers and the Sunday prior to the Nativity of Christ), while the relatively modern one sought to also create a third forefeast Sunday (the Sunday prior to the Sunday of the Forefathers) with the transfer of the Tenth Sunday of Luke to it.

6. A great part of the differences is owed to the change of the calendar, since the Kyriakodromia of the Slavic churches in these instances differ from the Kyriakodromia of the churches that adopted the Gregorian Calendar but are identical with the Kyriakodromia of the churches that maintain the Julian Calendar (Patriarchate of Jerusalem, Holy Mountain, and so forth). Thus, while the same pericopes are read from the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee up until Pentecost and the whole period of Matthew, namely, up until the beginning of September (even if the numbering of the days of the months on the calendar is different by thirteen days), they do not agree in the period of Luke. And this is understandable, since the fourteenth of September, which regulates the date of the Sunday after the Exaltation, is reckoned according to the "Old" Calendar the twenty-seventh of the Gregorian.[399] The whole sequence of Sunday

---

CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," Speculum 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

399. This is due to the difference of thirteen days between the two calendars.

and daily readings depends on the Monday after the Sunday after the Exaltation, which is impossible to agree for the reason above.

7. For the same reason, it is impossible for the reading of the pericopes prior to and after the Exaltation, prior to and after the Nativity of Christ, the Sunday of the Forefathers, the Sundays of the Holy Fathers, the Sundays prior to and after the feast of Lights, and so forth, to coincide on the same day.

8. Not transferring the Twelfth Sunday of Luke is also likely owed to the same cause, namely, because the Sundays after the feast of Lights and prior to the beginning of the Triōdion are two less according to the Julian Calendar, just as the Sundays of Matthew conversely are more. There is no reason for the transfer of the Twelfth of Luke.

9. The disturbance of the original pairing of epistle and gospel pericopes, which is observed in the modern Kyriakodromia due to their mistaken "correction" by Glyzōnios,[400] does not appear to have influenced the Slavonic practice. Consequently, the pericopes of the epistles for the period of Luke are read combined with the gospel pericopes according to their original order.

10. Finally, a lack of uniformity is often observed regarding the beginning of Luke, not only between a Greek and Slavic tradition, but also among the Slavonic Kyriakodromia themselves. This is obviously owed to different computations or different individual traditions. Thus, according to the Slavic Kyriakodromia when Pascha is very early (March 22 with the Old Calendar) the Sundays and weeks of Matthew are exhausted and the Monday after the Sunday prior to the Exaltation is considered as a Monday of the First Week of Luke. Conversely, in instances of a late Pascha, it appears that the start of Luke is influenced by the most ancient rubric concerning the new

400. Emmanouēl Glyzōnios or Glyzounios (Ἐμμανουὴλ Γλυζώνιος or Γλυζούνιος) (1540–1596), born in Chios and resident in Venice, was known as a publisher and editor of liturgical books, including the Psalter (1586), Gospel book (1588), Anthologion (1588), Mēnaia for September and October (1595), and Mēnaia for November (1596). He is credited with construction of lectionary guidelines in various editions of the Evangelistaria. This discussion is based on Χ. Γ. Πατρινέλης, "Γλυζούνιος, Ἐμμανουήλ," *ΘΗΕ* 4:567–568.

year (September 23).[401] However, in both cases, provision is made for the seventeen Sundays of Matthew to be expended.

In general terms, these are the chief main differences between Greek-speaking and Slavic-speaking churches regarding the reading of the pericopes. Other secondary ones could be noted, such as the pericope for the Sunday of the Holy Fathers of July, the end of the gospel reading for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, and so forth, regarding which we made mention in other previous answers.[402]

According to the *Confession* of Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, "some customs and taxeis both were and are dissimilar in different places and churches, but the unity of faith and agreement concerning dogmas is preserved the same."[403]

524

On March 10, the Mēnaion has two Vespers, one for the Holy Forty[404] and another for the Holy Martyr Quadratus.[405] When the commemoration of the Holy Forty occurs outside of Great Lent, which of the two Vespers must be chanted?

It is self-evident that the Vespers of Saint Quadratus alone will be chanted and the second Vespers of the Holy Forty will be omitted.

---

401. See question 432, where Phountoulēs states, "Luke follows from the Monday after the Sunday of the Exaltation or from the Monday after the 'new year, which is the equinox' [September 23], according to the more ancient rubrics." See question 433 for the ancient rubric being referenced, namely, the Typikon of Saint Sophia in Constantinople.

402. In particular, see questions 432 and 433.

403. Ἰωάννης Καρμίρης, *Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd edition (Graz: Akademische Druk u. Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 2: 899. The full sentence from the text reads, "Ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστορικῶν βίβλων δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ἔθη μὲν καὶ τάξεις τινὲς παρηλλαγμέναι ἦσαν τε καὶ εἰσὶν ἐν διαφόροις τόποις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις, ἡ ἑνότης δὲ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ὁμοφροσύνης περὶ τὰ δόγματα σῴζεται ἡ αὐτή." Phountoulēs identifies the text as from the *Confession* of Dositheos II of Jerusalem. The correct citation should be from the *Second Reply of the Orthodox Patriarchs of the East to the Nonjuring Anglicans* (1723), which introduced and appended the text of the *Confession*.

404. "Holy Forty" refers to the fourth century Holy Forty Martyrs of Sebaste.

405. Saint Quadratus was a third century martyr.

The latter is only chanted when the commemoration of the Holy Forty falls during Great Lent for the Presanctified to be celebrated. The Typikon in use does not provide for an instance of a celebration for the commemoration of the Holy Forty outside of Lent, because its rubrics have not been adjusted to the calendrical reality of the so-called "New" (Gregorian) Calendar. According to this calendar, Pascha shifts between April 4 and May 8. Consequently, March 9 in cases of a late Pascha is found outside of Lent. Conversely, according to the "Old" (Julian) Calendar, since Pascha shifts between March 22 and April 25, March 9 even in the case of a later Pascha falls in the First Week of the Fast. For this reason, the relevant rubric has been laid out in the Mēnaion. When March 9 is Saturday or Sunday, and consequently Presanctified is not celebrated, this second Vespers is omitted. The same things by analogy will also apply regarding the case to which the question refers.

The similar case of the commemoration of the First and Second Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner (February 24) should also be treated for the same reason in a similar manner. With the Old Calendar, it most commonly fell in Lent, for this reason the Mēnaion also has a second Vespers for the celebration of a Presanctified. In an instance where it would fall outside of Lent either on Saturday or Sunday, this Vespers for the Presanctified was omitted and the Vespers for February 25, the commemoration of Saint Tarasios,[406] was alone chanted. Now, with the New Calendar, February 24 falls within Great Lent only in a case of an early Pascha.

Finally, in the case of an early Pascha according to the Julian Calendar, the commemoration of Saint Charalampos[407] also fell within the First Week of the Fast and up until the Wednesday of the Second Week. However, since this was not common, it did not affect the service of the Mēnaion. However, there was a relevant rubric for an appropriate use. A second Vespers was then celebrated with troparia borrowed from the Vespers of the eve and then the Presanctified was celebrated, just as precisely also in the cases of the First and Second

406. Saint Tarasios, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 784–806).
407. A martyr of the second–third century.

Finding of the Head of the Forerunner and the commemoration of the Holy Forty.

525

During the Vespers (eves) of Nativity, the feast of Lights, and Great Saturday, after "O Gladsome Light..."[408] must "The evening"[409] be said? What meaning does "The evening" have without "Prokeimenon," since the liturgical books have "...and immediately the readings"?

According to the contemporary taxis, a prokeimenon (just as during the Vespers of Great Lent) is neither read nor chanted during these three Vespers, but after "O Gladsome Light..." the provided for readings are read. Consequently, the deacon (or the priest) does not say "The evening" in order for the reader to continue, "Prokeimenon, tone...,"[410] but, according to the more precise Typikon, he exclaims "Wisdom" in order for the reader to read the title of the reading. "The evening," where it is said, is said out of a habit acquired from the Lenten practice and naturally is wrongly said.

According to an older taxis, the prokeimenon of the day or another special prokeimenon was chanted, so "The evening [prokeimenon]"[411] had a reason to be exclaimed. However, this has not been practiced for some time. The development of this point of the service of Vespers for these three feasts presents a special interest and we dedicated an extensive article to it, which had been occasioned by three related questions (439, 440, and 441).[412]

526

During the service of the epitaphios, since disagreement exists in the liturgical books used, how many and which lamentations must be chanted?

---

408. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν..."
409. "Ἑσπέρας."
410. "Προκείμενον, ἦχος..."
411. "Ἑσπέρας [προκείμενον]."
412. Also see question 340.

527

In the official Triōdion, why do there also exist verses of the amōmos[413] together with the lamentations of Matins for Great Saturday resulting in confusion during the chanting?

We were given the opportunity by other questions in the past to characterize the service of Matins of Great Saturday as a "funeral service" for Christ.[414] This is not an exaggeration. The service of the epitaphios has been configured in such a way by the Fathers that it indeed has all the elements of the common funeral service, which was nothing more than a special Matins for a brother who has fallen asleep. Due to the length that it assumed and the cuts that necessarily ensued, the original funeral Matins itself is barely distinguishable even in the printed liturgical books, let alone in practice. The same thing also happened with the service of Great Saturday. The great length that it assumed, and the pressing needs of parish practice caused abridgments, and above all rearrangements and transfers, which make less obvious the elements shared with the common funeral service/Matins. From initially similar services, while more funereal elements, primarily hymnological, were preserved in the funeral service (amōmos by selection, evlogētaria, idiomela of lauds, aposticha), more Matins elements were preserved in the service of the Epitaphios (Six Psalms, "God is the Lord,"[415] canon, lauds, doxology). Thus, the comparison of the two parallel services in their contemporary form does not express, at least at first glance, what was originally meant, namely, that the Lord, who died as a human being, is also buried as a human being, and sent off to the tomb in the same manner as all human beings, in order to be resurrected as God.

The "amōmos" or the "amōmoi," namely, Psalm 118, which precisely begins, as is well known, with the phrase, "Blessed are the blameless in the way...,"[416] which gave it also its name, was, and is

413. Psalm 118.
414. See questions 207, 227, 265, 326, 357, 437, and 438.
415. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."
416. "Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῷ..."

in theory, a primitive vital element of the funeral service.[417] And in both services—the funeral and the Matins of Great Saturday—it is chanted with stichologia as a kathisma, just as also on Saturdays and Sundays, with the accompaniment of its stichēra, the evlogētaria. However, its great length (as is well known it consists of 176 verses) caused problems in parish practice, which in each instance were solved in a different manner. Thus, in the funeral service, only eighteen of the 176 verses were preserved, which are chanted in three staseis with their "asmatic" ephymnia ("Alleluia," "Have mercy on me, O Lord," "Alleluia"),[418] six per each stasis. The same thing also occurs by imitation in common memorial services. While they constitute an abridgment of the lengthy memorial service of the "vigil," which provides for the chanting of the amōmos as a kathisma in "two staseis," these in their developed form preserved the amōmos abridged, just as in the funeral service. The solution was good, since it preserved the chanting of the amōmos albeit in fragments, even if more fitting verses of the psalm could have been chosen. In the Matins of Great Saturday, the same reasons caused a seeking of a solution at a much later time, without, for precisely this reason, care being taken for the original specifications of the service to be preserved even in fragments. The solution was simple and radical: for the amōmos to be completely omitted. The official liturgical books (the Triōdion), as well as the monasteries, remained uncompromising.

However, the modern ancillary publications of Great Week or the popular editions of the Synopses, the Synekdēmoi, or the "Lamentation upon the Grave"[419] adopted this solution, not indeed introducing it, but capturing the commonly already observed practice, as more flexible and more sensitive to the prevailing changes. However, the term, "it is omitted" (παραλείπεται), a troublesome one for the consciences of pious persons, is not easily written. Thus, in some publications, the apparently pious solution also being used in other

417. Phountoulēs is referring to the fact that the Greek term for "blameless" (ἄμωμος) came to designate the name for Psalm 118 stemming from the first verse, "Blessed are the blameless in the way..." (Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῷ...).

418. "Ἀλληλούϊα," "Ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε," "Ἀλληλούϊα."

419. "Ἐπιτάφιος θρῆνος."

cases was invented that the amōmos "is read" prior to the lamentations or prior to the service, evidently by the priest "in the cells." It appears that the practice of the amōmos being read before the lamentations already had found ground in difficult times also in certain monasteries. Paradoxically, but not in an unusual way, the stichēra of the amōmos were preserved, namely, the evlogētaria, as a most vital and impressive element. Stichēra without the psalm was an unthinkable thing for the old correct practice, but there were quite a few precedents in later practice.

However, the fact that the amōmos was a crucial element in the service of Great Saturday becomes manifest not only from what up until now we wrote, but also inherently, from its very introduction into this service. It is well known that the kathismata of the Psalter "are absent"[420] from Great Wednesday up until the Saturday of Renewal Week. Consequently, Great Saturday does not have kathismata. Nevertheless, the amōmos is provided for by exception, precisely in order that the basic element of reference to and parallelism/identification with the funeral service of the faithful not be missing from the funeral service of Christ. However, the "lamentations" also substantially contributed to the omission of the amōmos on Great Saturday.

The "lamentations"[421] or "megalynaria"[422] or "epitaphia megalynaria"[423] or "makaristaria"[424] are, as is well known, short troparia, a type of "lamentation upon the grave,"[425] which were written to adorn the chanting of the amōmos. There is a total of 179 of them in the printed Triōdion, namely, as many as the verses of the amōmos (176), and they are distributed, as also the latter, in three staseis, which are concluded as usual with "Glory both now"[426] and with the repetition of the first troparion as a "perissē" at the end of each stasis (First 73+2+1, Second 60+2+1, Third 46+2). Thus, altogether, with

420. "σχολάζουν."
421. "Ἐγκώμια."
422. "Μεγαλυνάρια."
423. "Ἐπιτάφια μεγαλυνάρια."
424. "Μακαριστάρια."
425. "ἐπιταφίου θρήνου."
426. "Δόξα καὶ νῦν."

the troparia of "Glory both now" and the repetitions, they amount to the large number of 187 troparia. We repeat that they were not written for them to substitute for the amōmos, but to adorn it. This has a key importance for understanding everything that has been written so far and what will be written next.

And first of all, the question is answered why in the Triōdion the amōmos is published with the lamentations. Precisely because the amōmos is the chief element of the service and the lamentations depend on it. Thus, in the standard rubrics of the manuscripts, which precede this element of the service, it is correctly said: "In this manner, we begin the amōmos, but we also chant the epitaphia megalynaria with it in three staseis" (*Codex Sinai 1098*) or "and we immediately chant the verses of the amōmos with their megalynaria" (*Codex Vatopediou 1198*), and so forth. The "immediately" is not randomly inserted into these rubrics. At this point (after "God is the Lord..." and the apolytikia and prior to the fiftieth psalm and the canon), if it was not Great Saturday and the Psalter "was not absent," the stichologia of the sixteenth and seventeenth kathisma as well as the troparia/kathismata that accompany them ought to be inserted. However, on Great Saturday, precisely since the stichologia "is absent," the sixteenth kathisma is omitted (as well as any troparia/kathismata that would have accompanied it) and the stichologia of the amōmos "immediately" takes place for the reasons that we already set forth. The troparia/kathismata, which are chanted nowadays at this point ("In a clean linen, and with divine spices..."[427] and so forth), are the kathismata after the amōmos. Just as we saw in the response to questions 437–438 (which concerned the exclamations of the service of Great Saturday), the transfer of the lamentations after the canons, which was done during modern times, was not simply "a transfer" but a catastrophic interference in the splendid service. However, splendid things are also fragile and great things are managed with difficulty. Already in the Triōdion in use, although the original taxis was precisely preserved, in the standard rubrics that preceded the amōmos/lamentations it begins to specify what was to

427. "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀρώμασι θείοις..."

happen later. The tables are turned, and the priority is shifted from the amōmos to its stichēra, to the lamentations: "After these things [after "God is the Lord..." and the apolytikia] we begin to melodiously chant the troparia that follow, namely, the lamentations, with the amōmos, in three staseis, while saying one of its verses after each single troparion." The rubric is clearly mistaken. The verse precedes and the troparion follows and is dependent on it. The amōmos is divided "into three staseis" and the troparia, by necessity, follow along together. This overemphasis of the lamentations versus the amōmos had natural consequences on the subsequent development of the service. The troparia became independent in practice and were chanted for convenience alone, and the amōmos essentially fell into disuse. That which we wrote in another instance (concerning the canons and the stichologia of the odes) perhaps, more so, applies here.[428] If the sacred hymnographers had anticipated that their troparia would consume the amōmos, they would not have written them or at least not have written so many. This is not a form of exaggeration, as will also be shown from the following.

We always speak concerning the practice of the parishes. The 187 troparia were too many. Once their cohesive skeleton (the amōmos) collapsed, the anticipated leakage began. From 187 in modern printed editions, they were limited to 120 (forty per stasis) and from 120 to 90 (thirty per stasis). And again, it was a lot. The chanting of all required two hours, as much as the time anticipated for the entire service. The Six Psalms and the canon had already preceded, and time had to be left for the evlogētaria, lauds, and the doxology. Put to the test of practice, not even the reduced number of lamentations could be kept intact, as they were prescribed in modern unofficial and semiofficial printed editions, namely, to thirty troparia for each stasis. Other reasons, this time internal, also contributed to this.

Quite a lot has been written concerning the lamentations by various learned scholars, and opposing positions were largely argued with passion, without actually solving the many and varied historical-philological problems associated with them. And worst of all,

428. See questions 422 and 468.

based on preconceived notions and without the necessary critical foundation or with rudimentary research into the manuscripts—transfers, omissions, and critical grammatical, syntactical, and metrical corrections were made, which generally provided a tolerable text from a practical point of view, but complicated their already troubled text.

Particularly, many troparia of the second stasis chiefly, but less of the first and third, do not agree with their heirmos and have excess or deficient syllables and accents. The correctors hurried to fix all of these, despite the opinion of others that the differences were intentional and were owed to "changes" in the manner of chanting the meter, melody, and rhythm. However, the 187 troparia thus set to three heirmoi and chanted continuously without the interjections of the amōmos's verses, reduced their chanting to being "monotonous" and "annoying." These judgments come from a writing of the former metropolitan of Leontopolis, Sōphronios Eustratiadēs, a most learned and educated man.[429] The judgments are perhaps excessive, but not completely unjust, if indeed the time during which they are chanted, the length of the service, the attendance of many people, and the expectation of the impending procession are taken under consideration. Moreover, this reason also caused the reduction of the number of troparia in the printed editions and in practice.

These arbitrary measures would be absent if a more reasonable and practical number of hymns were officially prescribed, and their choice and number was not left to the judgment of chanters and particularly of choirs. The correct cuts certainly are painful, but it is better to do them once in a responsible way, rather than for all the troparia to be abandoned, so that the tradition is not afflicted and all kinds of arbitrary and indiscriminate choices, sometimes spur of the

429. Sōphronios Eustratiadēs (Σωφρόνιος Εὐστρατιάδης), Metropolitan of Leontopolis (1872–1947, r. 1908–1913), was born in Asia Minor, studied in Jerusalem, graduated from the theological school of the Great Church at Halki, and was awarded his doctorate in Vienna. He founded the theological journal, *Gregorios ho Palamas* (*Γρήγοριος ὁ Παλαμάς*) in Thessaloniki and eventually died in Paris. He published a large number of works focused on hagiography, hymnology, and paleography. This summary is based on Ἰωάννης Χ. Κωσταντινίδης, "Σωφρόνιος ὁ Εὐστρατιάδης," *ΘΗΕ* 11:649–652.

moment, are encouraged in practice. I think that it is more preferable to chant a few troparia with the verses of the amōmos, namely in their natural liturgical framework, than many unconnected and monotonous ones. Let the remainder, properly organized and planned again, be chanted during the stops of the procession, as is also now often done randomly and unplanned.[430]

I would venture a proposal without being optimistic about its outcome, which would preserve both the lamentations and above all the neglected, lightly taken, ancient and basic element of the service of the epitaphios, the amōmos.

1. A half hour prior to the beginning of the service, the amōmos should be read, integrated into a liturgical framework ("Blessed...,"[431] trisagion and so forth, and dismissal at the end). Thus, the clatter and disorder that the attendance of many faithful and the veneration of the epitaphios create prior to the beginning of the service would be covered in a respectable manner, and in addition the chanting of the amōmos would be preserved, as the practice all along requires.

2. The verse of the amōmos that has been chosen for the funeral services, would precede the lamentations, naturally without the ephymnion, "Alleluia," "Have mercy on me, O Lord," and "Alleluia." Thus, six lamentations would be chanted for each stasis, which with the two of "Glory...both now" and the repetition of the first makes nine, namely, altogether twenty-seven, a number neither too large, but nor also too small. Thus, not only the connection between amōmos and lamentations is preserved, but the funereal character of the service is also strongly highlighted with its obvious parallelism with the common funeral, in accordance with the initial intent of the Fathers and the Typika. Moreover, the insertion of the verse would interrupt the monotony of the continual chanting of the troparia.

---

430. In Greece and in Greek diaspora communities, the epitaphios is processed through neighborhoods and villages during the Matins of Great Saturday. While processing, the trisagion and random troparia are often sung. In addition, stops are made for short petitions.

431. "Εὐλογητός..."

3. Finally, the lamentations, which have not been chanted during the service, should be chanted during the procession, a thing that would also preserve them from the corruption nowadays threatened.

Since we are discussing the lamentations and their historical-philological and liturgical mishaps and the controversies caused regarding them, let it be noted that these popular hymns are already encountered in manuscripts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. They are not earlier (it has been argued that they date back to the eighth century), but nor also from the period of the Tourkokratia[432] (as argued by others). They are not works of the same author, nor were all written in the same period, and for this reason their manuscript tradition is quite confusing.

Their chanting is not provided for by the ancient Typika but is encountered in the modern ones and appears that it gradually became prevalent. They are most commonly called "μεγαλυνάρια" (megalynaria) in the manuscripts, obviously from the first ones which had been introduced ("Μεγαλύνομέν σε, ζωοδότα Χριστέ...," We magnify you, O life-giver Christ...) and which initially were repeated at each verse of the amōmos. However, the modern term "ἐγκώμια" (lamentations) does not appear to be inappropriate, as it is argued, but was probably used in order for them to be distinguished from the similarly named megalynaria of the ninth ode of the canons. Similar megalynaria or lamentations are encountered in the manuscripts and in the printed editions for the Theotokos, the Forerunner, and other saints, which have been composed in imitation of the lamentations of Great Saturday. Regarding the corrective measures or the hymnological studies that refer to them, those of Nikodēmos Neoklēs (1906),[433] Pankratios Vatopaidinos (1920),[434] Emmanouēl

---

432. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

433. Νικόδημος Νεοκλής, *Ἡ Ἁγία καὶ Μεγάλη Ἑβδομάς: περιέχουσα τὰς ἱερᾶς ἀκολουθίας τῶν Νυμφίων, τῶν Ἁγίων Παθῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ Ὄρθρου, τῆς Λειτουργίας, καὶ τοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ τῆς Μεγάλης Κυριακῆς τοῦ Πάσχα, καταρτισθεῖσα κελεύσει τῆς Α.Θ.Π τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου κυρίου κ. Ἰωακεὶμ τοῦ Γ'* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1906).

434. Παγκράτιος Βατοπαιδινός, *Ὁ ἐπιτάφιος θρῆνος ἢ τὰ ἐγκώμια τοῦ Μεγάλου Σαββάτου: διορθωθέντα* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Τύποις Ἐ. Βασιλειάδου, 1918).

Pantelakēs (1936),[435] Sōphronios Eustratiadēs, the former Metropolitan of Leontopolis (1938),[436] and Emmanouēl Pharlekas[437] and others could be mentioned.

528

During the great entrance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, is the paten held with the priest's left hand, as in the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos, or with the right hand in honor of the presanctified Holy Bread?

In the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified, those things that are not peculiar to it, which are especially prescribed by the standard rubrics, are performed according to the model of the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos. Consequently, also as to this point, given that it is not prescribed otherwise, whatever also takes place in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is done, namely, the paten is held with the left hand, and the chalice with the right.

The reverse practice began to be promoted recently for reasons of piety and is encountered in the newest printed editions of liturgical books. It is not known by the manuscripts, the printed editions, and even the relevant oral tradition and practice. It is persistently supported by some, as if it concerned a subject of key importance and venerable tradition, where its violation affects blessed and sacred things. In essence, it only creates practical problems and introduces pedantic accusations largely naïve and not attested to by our tradition. Indeed, some go further placing the holy paten on the right side of the priest as a sign of honor both in the proskomidē and on

435. Ἐμμανουὴλ Παντελάκης, *Νέα ἐγκώμια τοῦ Ἐπιταφίου: ἐκ Σιναϊτικοῦ χειρογράφου* (Ἀθῆναι: τύποις «Φοίνικος», 1936).

436. Σωφρόνιος Εὐστρατιάδης, "Ἡ ἀκολουθία τοῦ Μεγάλου Σαββάτου καὶ τὰ Μεγαλυνάρια τοῦ Ἐπιταφίου," *Νέα Σιών* 32 (1937): 16–23, 145–152, 209–226, 273–288, 337–353, 465–480, 529–545, 593–608, 657–673, Νέα Σιών 33 (1938): 19–28, 370–377, 433–452.

437. Ἐμμανουὴλ Φαρλέκας, *Ἡ Ἁγία καὶ Μεγάλη Ἑβδομάς: περιλαμβάνει ὁλόκληρον τὸ Ἁισματικὸν Μέρος τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὄρθρου τῆς Μεγάλης Δευτέρας μέχρι τοῦ Μεγάλου Σαββάτου Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν κατὰ τὸ ὕφος τῶν Διδασκάλων ἐν πάσῃ λεπτομερείᾳ μετά τῆς Τυπικῆς Διατάξεως αὐτῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπ. "Μέλισσα," n.d.).

the holy table after the entrance. The whole matter reminds me of the dispute "concerning which is the right side," on which the particle of the Theotokos must be placed during the proskomidē, on the right side of the priest or the right side of the lamb, which arose during the seventeenth century. The fact that the precious Body has priority among the eucharistic species is indisputable. In the words of institution, in the consecration of the precious gifts, and at every anaphora in the prayers, the mention or blessing of the Holy Bread always precedes according to the model of the Mystical Supper, and that of the cup follows. The same thing is also the case in the proskomidē—the lamb is excised first, and the union of the chalice is done afterwards. However, this does not prevent the paten from being held by the deacon; and when the priest celebrates alone it does not prevent him from holding the chalice with his right hand and the paten with his left. The same taxis is indeed also attested to by the manuscripts for the Presanctified, during which according to the correct taxis the priest placed the paten with the precious Body "over the head of the deacon," while the priest held the unconsecrated chalice, just as also during the entrance of the complete Liturgy. And in communion, the precious Body is offered first during the partaking of the celebrants and afterwards the precious Blood, just as also originally in the case of the people. And again, this did not prevent the chalice from being located both in the prothesis and on the holy table to the right of the priest, and the paten on the left. In all these instances, the correct taxis is not prescribed by ungrounded theories of piety and peculiar novel pietisms, but by practical reasons. Especially the transfer of both vessels by the priest alone during the great entrance (as became prevalent to be done in the absence of a deacon, but even more so the same practice during the great entrance of the Presanctified), presupposes coordination of both hands regarding the paten for its placement over the head of the priest and its placement on the holy table after the entrance for reasons of security, while the chalice due to its form is easier to handle. Conversely, their reverse placing and unaccustomed holding during the entrance could only cause problems for no reason.

During the retrospection into our liturgical tradition while treating various related questions, we often discover corruptions in the liturgical taxis that are owed to pious practices uncontrolled and not subordinate, as they should be, to venerable and dignified liturgical practice. No one can doubt that they are motivated by pious intentions. However, this does not pardon them, but on the contrary condemns them because piety is synonymous with obedience and humility. And our worship, as we have also written in the past, is not endangered as much by those outside as by those from within. By subjective apparently pious initiatives, which do not respect the traditional taxis in the name of piety. Classical examples are this recent pious invention and the older one regarding the right side of the proskomidē. Unfortunately, they are not the only ones. We have seen quite a few and will also meet others more characteristic in the next answers.

529

Supplementary points regarding the question of the consecration of the paten's particles and of communion or not from them.[438]

The topic of the consecration of the paten's particles, namely, of their change into the Body of Christ during the invocation of the Holy Spirit, or their consecration by participation when they are cast into the precious Blood, was not "closed." In earlier answers to relevant questions (180, 181, and 182), we referred to the testimonies of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, Theophilos of Kampania, Gabriēl Sevēros, and Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain. All four of them clearly teach that the particles of the saints and the faithful living and dead are not changed into the Body of Christ, neither during the invocation nor when they are cast into the holy chalice and soaked with the precious Blood. Consequently, they bring to the priest's attention not to commune the faithful from them, since the Lord expressly handed down and the Church always received and

438. In addition, see the questions referenced in this answer concerning the particles and also question 591.

observed that communion is imparted under both species, namely, of the Lord's Body and Blood. In confirmation of this position's precision, the fact would perhaps be sufficient that the celebrants always partake from the lamb—the precious Body of Christ—and never from the particles.

In a recent answer (518) in connection with new questions, we returned to the topic and presented Saint Symeōn's addition by his own hand in the margins of folios 34–35 of the *Codex Zagora 23*, where he sets forth his positions most clearly and in detail.

A more official text is now added to the preceding ones. This concerns a synodal letter of Ecumenical Patriarch Paisios I (1651–1652 and 1654–1655) to Nikon of Moscow.[439] Paisios formally responds to twenty-seven "questions" that the hierarch of Moscow submitted by his letter. Our topic is treated in the "first question" concerning the "taxis of the Divine Liturgy according to the custom that we maintain throughout the whole East," to which is also added "some small explanation, for the taxis to be methodically gone through step-by-step." We cite the whole relevant passage of the text, just as it is written with simplicity and clarity in the characteristic colloquial language of that period, without unnecessary comments:

"And after holy communion [he means, of the celebrants], the deacon taking the paten and saying the resurrectional hymns, namely, 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...,'[440] 'Shine, shine, O new Jerusalem...,'[441] and 'O great and most sacred Pascha...,'[442] gathers together the remaining Body [he means the pieces of the lamb] and transfers them from the paten to the chalice, together with all the particles of the saints and persons living and having fallen asleep. On account of which many Latins blame us that we mix humans together with the deified Body of Christ and that humans apparently become Christ's Body; but our Church, Orthodox and blameless, is not guilty or culpable of such charges, because it is never possible for naked and bare humanity to become by nature

439. Patriarch of Moscow (r. 1652–1666).
440. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."
441. "Φωτίζου, φωτίζου ἡ νέα Ἱερουσαλήμ..."
442. "Ὦ πάσχα τὸ μέγα καὶ ἱερώτατον, Χριστέ..."

God the same way the bread became changed by the Holy Spirit; but even though it attaches itself to Jesus and the two are mixed into one just as also takes place when humanity communes of the divine Mysteries, humanity does not change into God, it only receives divine grace from Christ, and again humanity remains human even if it also receives grace. And for this reason, the priest must pay attention not to distribute from the particles for any Christian to partake, lest he fall into idolatry. Our Church's view, on account of which he puts the particles for humans within the chalice, is to cleanse the sins of those remembered with the precious Blood of the Master, and it is the same as if John[443] [so to speak], when he stood at the Cross, would desire to take some sinner and to bring him underneath the wounds of Jesus where blood flowed, to cleanse him with it; because that human being then did not become Christ according to nature, but only one who has been cleansed and washed of sin with Christ's Blood; for this reason also many in our eparchy, wherever they are knowledgeable about the present view, say afterwards when they put the particles into the chalice these words of the resurrection prayers, 'Wash away, O Lord, by your precious Blood, the sins of those here remembered, through the intercessions of your saints.'[444] And even if not everyone says this, but seeing that the Blood of Christ has the power to cleanse transgressions, it does that with its activity whether we say this or do not say this, and all the power of the priesthood depends on this."

---

443. The writer is clearly putting the priest in the position of Saint John the Theologian and vice versa. The flowing of Christ's Blood also recalls its flow upon the skull of Adam at Golgotha.

444. "Ἀπόπλυνον, Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐνταῦθα μνημονευθέντων τῷ αἵματί σου τῷ τιμίῳ, πρεσβείαις τῶν ἁγίων σου." In the 2018 edition of the Divine Liturgy published by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, the text reads, "Ἀπόπλυνον, Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐνταῦθα μνημονευθέντων δούλων τῷ αἵματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ, πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου" (translated, "Wash away, O Lord, by your precious Blood, the sins of your servants here remembered, through the intercessions of the Theotokos and all your saints"), Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints John Chrysostom, Large Clergy Edition* (New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 47.

The synodal letter is published in the book of Archimandrite Kallinikos Delikanēs. *Patriarchal Documents*, volume three, in Constantinople 1905, pp. 36–71, and the above passage on pages 53–54.[445]

There is another text eighty years earlier than the Synodal Letter of Ecumenical Patriarch Paisios I to Nikon of Moscow, which we quote below. This is from one of the earliest printed editions, which was done in Venice in 1574, with the title, *The Divine Liturgy with Explanations of Various Teachers.* The priest Iōannēs Nathanaēl (or Nathanaēlos[446]) "oikonomos and representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople the Lord Hieremias" (II, 1536–1595) wrote this commentary "in the common language." In chapter seventy-five (page 30 b), which has a title, "Concerning the particles of those offered at the prothesis for the saints and all the pious,"[447] he briefly refers to the topic that occupies us, when adding on the margin the phrase, "Pay attention well." "However, the particles do not undergo change either into the Body of the Lord or into the bodies of the saints, but are only gifts, offerings, and sacrifices with bread in imitation of the Lord and are offered to the Lord Himself in the name of them and are sanctified in the holy work of the Mysteries with the mixing, mingling, and combination, and convey sanctification both to those for whom the Liturgy takes place and for us."[448]

---

445. Καλλίνικος Δελικάνης, ed., *Πατριαρχικῶν Ἐγγράφων Τόμος Τρίτος ἤτοι Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Ἀρχειοφυλακείου σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικά ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς Ἐκκλησίας Ρωσσίας, Βλαχίας, καὶ Μολδαβίας, Σερβίας Ἀχριδῶν καὶ Πεκίου 1564–1863 οἷς προστίθεται ἱστορικὴ μελέτη περὶ τῆς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Ἀχριδῶν* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1904), 3:53–54.

446. Ναθαναῆλος.

447. "Περὶ τῶν μερίδων τῶν προσφερομένων εἰς τὴν πρόθεσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ πάντων τῶν εὐσεβῶν."

448. Ἰωάννης Ναθαναήλ, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία μετὰ ἐξηγήσεων διαφόρων διδασκάλων, ἅσπερ μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γλῶτταν* (Venice: Iacomo Leoncini, 1574), 30. Iōannēs Nathanaēl held the office of great oikonomos and lived during the last half of the sixteenth century. For a short biography, see Κωνσταντῖνος Σάθας, *Νεοελληνικὴ Φιλολογία: Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων, ἀπὸ τῆς κατάλύσεως τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἐθνεγερσίας (1453–1821)* (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκ τῆς τυπογραφίας τῶν τέκνων

He more extensively returns to the topic of the consecration of the particles and communion from them in the immediately following chapter seventy-six, which has the distinctive title, "Concerning holy communion, that the priest must not commune either himself or anyone else from the particles, except from the Body of the Lord alone" (pages 31 b–32 a).[449] And again he adds in the margin: "Pay attention O priest." Here is what he says: "Know that the priest must pay attention not to partake from the particles in the communion of the awesome Mysteries, but from the Flesh of the Lord, and to commune those who approach to worthily commune. For it would have been fine if the particles became one with the commixture and mixing of both the Body and Blood of the Lord,[450] but since it is necessary for each believer to commune from the Body together also with the Blood of Christ, let the priest taking the Body and Blood of the Lord with the labis commune the one who wishes to approach to commune worthily. And while it is true that all the particles have been mingled and have acquired sanctification and were sanctified and became holy when having been gathered into a single chalice and mixed with the holy Body and Blood of Christ, it is better to commune each one from the Body and Blood of Christ.[451] And this is according to the oldest tradition, just as we received from the holy Fathers to carry out at communion the

---

Ἀνδρέου Κορομηλά, 1868), 231. A more extensive discussion of Nathanaël and his work is found in Παναγιώτης Σκαλτσής, "Ἡ Ὀρθόδοξη Λατρεία κατὰ τὴν Τουρκοκρατία," *ΙΒ' Λειτουργικὸ Συμπόσιο Στελεχῶν Ἱερῶν Μητροπόλεων* (http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/commitees/liturgical/ib_skaltsis_tourk.pdf, accessed September 16, 2021).

449. "Περὶ τῆς Θείας κοινωνίας ὅτι δὲν πρέπει ὁ ἱερεὺς νὰ κοινωνεῖ ἀπὸ ταῖς μερίδες μὴ δὲ αὐτὸς μὴ δὲ τινὰ ἄλλον εἰμὴ ἀπὸ τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μόνον." Ἰωάννης Ναθαναήλ, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία μετὰ ἐξηγήσεων διαφόρων διδασκάλων, ἅσπερ μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γλῶτταν* (Venice: Iacomo Leoncini, 1574), 31–32.

450. "Διότι καλὰ νὰ ἔγιναν αἱ μερίδες ἕν πράγμα μὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν καὶ σμίξιν καὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ." In other words, it would have been fine if just adding the particles to the Eucharist made them into the Body and Blood of Christ, but such is not the case.

451. A distinction is made here between the mixed particles that have acquired holiness and the lamb that has been consecrated to become the Body of Christ.

tradition of our God and Savior for the faithful in the same manner that Christ also universally distributed His Body to the apostles...At any rate, the priest must take with the labis the precious Body and Blood of the Lord together and distribute them when they ought to commune. Note that the particles that are in memory of the saints and the faithful are not changed, because the priest when bringing the loaf into the prothesis excises that one alone in remembrance, namely, in the recollection of the Lord, just as He said, but the particles in memory and recollection of saint [name] and forgiveness of the living or dead, and that before the priest excises the particles, immediately after he excises the lamb and performs the union of the chalice then he brings the particles.[452] But if there is a need to bring more loaves for Presanctified Liturgies, first he offers them all and says 'in remembrance of the Lord,' *and he unites the chalice, and after this he offers the particles, inasmuch as the loaves alone are in remembrance of the Lord.*[453] But even the prosphora from which the bread is brought forth in remembrance of the Lord, first is called antidōron...and the remaining prosphorai, from which come the particles of the saints, are not even named antidōron."

We quoted the passage from the explanation of Iōannes Nathanaël to also show the consistency and continuity of the Church's teaching and practice in question, and the steady course that is followed by all the teachers that refer to this topic. Iōannes Nathanaël adds almost nothing special. However, his text in its simplicity and in his form of plain popular language is exceptionally beautiful. Moreover, this book is so rare and difficult to find, that it would be worth it for us to take a small taste of familiarity from it.

---

452. This text emphasizes that one loaf is being used for the lamb alone and the union of the chalice (the mixture of wine and water) takes place prior to any particles being excised, which emphasizes their distinction.

453. A portion of the text is missing, "καὶ ἑνοῖ τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τᾶς μερίδας προσφέρει, εἰς τόσον ὅτι εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ κυρίου," before, "οἱ ἄρτοι, μόνοι." The translation above in italics includes the missing phrase. The emphasis is again placed on the preparation of the lamb and the union of the chalice taking place first prior to the excision of the particles, which emphasizes their distinction. For the missing text, see Ἰωάννης Ναθαναήλ, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία μετὰ ἐξηγήσεων διαφόρων διδασκάλων, ἅσπερ μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γλῶτταν* (Venice: Iacomo Leoncini, 1574), 32.

The Orthodox Church's tradition, as expressed by its six witnesses that we mentioned, is clear and unanimous: the particles for the saints and faithful are not changed during the consecration into the Body of Christ and neither the priest nor the faithful commune from them, but from the lamb, namely, the precious Body of the Lord.

530

According to the Typikon of Saint Sabas, in the Matins of Great Saturday, is the same gospel reading "On the next day…" (twelfth gospel of the holy Passions: Matthew 27:62–66) read twice, once prior to the fiftieth psalm and once at the end after the return of the epitaphios,[454] or is the rubric mistaken? Why is it so unclear?

531

In the Matins of the Saturday of Lazarus, the Triōdion records: "Next a reading is done of the sixty-third and sixty-fourth sermons on the Gospel according to John concerning the feast. But we do not read a gospel but rather 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ'[455] is said alone." What does this rubric mean? Does some ambiguity exist? Do we or do we not say a gospel reading?

It is true that the standard rubrics of our liturgical books are not always clear. This is chiefly due to their concise character. Namely, they are not descriptive treatises, in some manner textbooks, which are meant to analyze and to teach how the various services of the Church are conducted for persons who do not know and wish to learn. They are remindful concise instructions directed at ones knowledgeable of the liturgical taxis. Consequently, it is expected that they presuppose a knowledge of subjects that for those who are experts in divine worship, especially the monastics, are self-evi-

454. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 345, 346.

455. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι."

dent, but for others enigmatic. In modern printed editions, an attempt is often made for analysis and clearer expression, which is not always successful. And this is because the rubrics are customarily formulated with insufferable pedantry, with twisted syntax, and in an inappropriate pseudo-archaic language, so-called, "ecclesiastical." But even the length that these new rubrics employ also make them practically unwieldy, if not useless, since the red letters of the rubrics often end up being more than the black ones of the text. The liturgical book is a book handy for the performance of divine worship, which is used at the time of worship by the priest, deacon, reader, and chanter. By necessity, the standard rubrics, in order to correctly fulfill their purpose, must be concise and simple and syntactically worded "side by side," just as in the old Typika and in the formal instructions inserted into the ancient manuscripts and into the old, printed editions. They are not educational books for those who do not know but instruments in the experienced hands of celebrants or the other officiants of worship. Clarity always remains the desirable outcome. These are the points concerning liturgical books and the standard rubrics that exist in them.

At the same time, there existed the "Typika" or the Diataxeis" or "Explanations," which described matters concerning the liturgical taxis in detail. These were created in late Byzantine times when the oral liturgical tradition had begun to wane, and the need for its recording presented itself imposed by circumstances. The most characteristic text of this type is the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy, Vespers, and Matins*, of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos of Constantinople (fourteenth century). One such detailed "Explanation" of the Divine Liturgy, from the codex 343 of the Monastery of Koutloumousiou of the Holy Mountain, of the sixteenth–seventeenth century, adds to the title a phrase indicative of the aim and purpose of these detailed rubrics: *Explanation for those uninstructed in the Divine Liturgy.*[456] These texts are detailed and clear, intended for the study and learning of the "uninstructed," naturally prior to worship and not during it, such as the two concise and remindful rubrics of

456. "Ερμηνεία εἰς τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς τῆς θείας λειτουργίας."

both questions. For this reason, in the questions above, there indeed exists some vagueness. Both also refer to parallel cases, and for this reason we examine them together.

The monastic Matins in its festive form (Sundays and feasts) has, as is well known, a gospel reading. Its standard place is between a stichologia of the Psalter and a stichologia of the odes (canons), but more precisely after the anabathmoi and both prokeimena (the movable and the "Let everything that has breath praise the Lord"[457]) and prior to the fiftieth psalm. Historically, this is about an insertion from the service of the "asmatic" Pannychis (anabathmoi – two prokeimena – gospel reading), which found a place between the ancient Midnight Office, namely the old evening monastic psalmody (Six Psalms – stichologia of the kathismata of the Psalter), and the ancient service of Matins.[458]

---

457. "Πᾶσα πνοὴ αἰνεσάτω τὸν Κύριον."

458. In question 282, Phountoulēs provides the following discussion of the Pannychis:

> This is about the 'asmatic' service of the Pannychis (παννυχίς), which was celebrated in parish temples of the Byzantine empire before the prevalence of the monastic Jerusalemite service of Compline. It was originally celebrated on the evening of all days of the year. Its celebration was later limited only to great feasts, Great Lent, and Great Week. Finally, it was preserved in its penitential form for the first five days of the first week of the Fast. A remnant of this practice is the series of gospel pericopes that were preserved in our liturgical books in use, in the gospel readings, where also their reading was preserved in the monastic service of Compline in parallel to the Pannychis. The 'asmatic' Pannychis is not an all-night service, as its name might mislead us to assume [Note: In Greek, the term, 'παννυχίς,' is composed from the words, πᾶσα (all) and νύξ (night)], but a relatively short service, the celebration of which does not last more than one hour. In other words, the Pannychis was an evening service, which was celebrated after supper, as a kind of small vigil, a parish Compline, which also had quite a few things in common with the monastic Great Compline, such as Psalm 90 ('He who lives by the help of the Most High...'), the hymn, 'As a bodiless nature, the Cherubim...,' (Ἡ ἀσώματος φύσις...) and so forth. Therefore, it was natural for the service that replaced the 'asmatic' Pannychis in the parishes to also preserve certain of its elements just as happened in this case with the gospel readings.

We said that in the service of Matins after the stichologia of the kathismata of the Psalter and the troparion/kathisma ("anapausimon"),[459] which was chanted after the last stichologia, "a reading was placed" that related to the gospel of the day or to the feast. This was done whether a gospel reading of Matins would follow (anabathmoi – prokeimena – gospel reading) or not. Thus, during the Saturday of Lazarus according to the Typikon of Saint Sabas and according to the Triōdion, which follows the latter, there was done a reading of two sermons of Chrysostomos on the Gospel according to John: "And we do a reading of the sixty-third and sixty-fourth sermons concerning the feast from the commentary on the Gospel according to John" (Typikon of Saint Sabas)[460] or "Next a reading is done of the sixty-third and sixty-fourth sermons on the Gospel according to John concerning the feast" (Triōdion). This concerns the sermons of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos on John 11:30–40 "A great good is philosophy..." (Sixty-three)[461] and on 11:41–48 "What I often said, I say this also now..." (Sixty-four),[462] which explain the main part of the gospel reading of the Divine Liturgy. Therefore, it has become clear what the somewhat unclear standard rubric means: A gospel reading for Matins is not read on the Saturday of Lazarus. The reading of sermons sixty-three and sixty-four of the commentary by Iōannēs Chrysostomos on the gospel, relates to the gospel of the Liturgy and is done at this point of the service according to the taxis of the monastic Typikon. In parishes, these readings are not done and for this

---

See also, Miguel Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis' de l'ancien Euchologe byzantine et la 'Panikhida' des défunts," *OCP* 40 (1974): 314–343 and *OCP* 41 (1975): 119–139; and Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 45–82.

459. "ἀναπαύσιμον." This word can refer to repose, which in this context appears to imply a resting point for the congregation in order to listen to a reading. See also question 557 for an additional discussion of this word, where the correlation to a sitting posture is made.

460. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 319.

461. "Μέγα ἀγαθὸν ἡ φιλοσοφία...," PG 59:349–354.

462. "Ὃ πολλάκις εἶπον τοῦτο καὶ νῦν ἐρῶ...," PG 59:353–360.

reason the modern parish Typika (Kōnstantinos and Violakēs),[463] as well as the annually published *Calendar-Typika*[464] or yearbooks, provide for "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." and the fiftieth psalm after the troparion/kathisma, "The source of wisdom...."[465] Thus, the rubric was simplified. However, the old form stays in the Triōdion to puzzle pious persons, lovers of learning and of our liturgical taxis and tradition. Let a detail also be added for the latter. The readings were not the same in all monasteries and during all periods. For example, in the Typikon of the Evergetis and in the Typikon of the Savior of Messina, on the Saturday of Lazarus, we have a reading from the sermon of Saint Andreas of Crete on Lazarus, which begins, "Lazarus summoned the present gathering...,"[466] in the modern Typikon of the monastery of Diony-

463. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 231; Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 352.

464. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

465. "Ἡ πηγὴ τῆς σοφίας..."

466. "Λάζαρος τὸν παρόντα συγκεκρότηκε σύλλογον..." Saint Andrew of Crete, *Sermon Eight*, PG 97:959a–986b. On this sermon and its liturgical use, see Mary Cunningham, "Andreas of Crete's Homilies on Lazarus and Palm Sunday: The Preacher and His Audience," *Studia Patristica* 31, ed. E.A. Livingtone (Leuven: Peters, 1997), 22–41. For its use at the monastery of the Evergetis, see Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 450–451. For its use at the monastery of the Savior of Messina, see Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 226. For a translation and critical edition of the sermon, see Mary Cunningham, "Andreas of Crete's Homilies on Lazarus and Palm Sunday: A Critical Edition and Commentary" (PhD diss., The University of Birmingham, 1983), 230–262. There is scholarly disagreement regarding the dating of the Saint's life, which is generally listed as ca. 660–740.

siou a reading "in the Dasmaskēnos the prose-writer,"[467] and in the Typikon of the hieromonk Methodios, "in the *Salpigx*."[468]

The gospel of the Matins for Great Saturday is the well-known pericope of the Gospel according to Matthew (27:62–66), which refers to the events that occurred "on the next day, namely, after the day of Preparation," namely on (Great) Saturday, the appearance of the high priests before Pilate and the sealing of the stone of the Lord's tomb. The gospel reading also even in the monastic Typikon

467. "εἰς στὸν Δαμασκηνὸν τὸν πεζογράφον." Dasmaskēnos (Δαμασκηνός) the Stoudite (d. 1577), initially a subdeacon and monk of the Stoudite Monastery in Constantinople where he was educated, served the Ecumenical Throne in several capacities (including as an exarch in Russia), was eventually ordained to the episcopate, and was appointed to the see of Nafpaktos and Arta as metropolitan in 1574. He was known as an educator and for his collection of sermons, *Θησαυρὸς Δαμασκηνοῦ ὑποδιακόνου καὶ Στουδίτου τοῦ Θεσσαλονικέως, μετὰ τῆς προσθήκης ἐν τῷ τέλει καὶ ἑτέρων ἑπτὰ Λόγων ψυχωφελεστάτων καὶ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τοῦ Πάτερ ἡμῶν* (Venice: C. Zanetti, 1561), which remains a popular work and has been republished numerous times up until the present. For basic information, see Τάκης Φ. Χριστόπουλος, "Δαμασκηνός," *ΘΗΕ* 4:907.

468. "εἰς τὴν Σάλπιγγα," Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 349. The full title of the work referenced (Salpigx) in the Typikon of Methodios is: Μακάριος ὁ Καλογεράς, *Εὐαγγελικὴ Σάλπιγξ ἐκφωνηθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ ποτὲ Ἱεροδιδασκάλου Μακαρίου χρηματίσαντος καθηγεμόνος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Πάτμον νῆσον Ἑλληνομουσίου, Νῦν πρῶτον τύποις ἐκδοθεῖσα καὶ εἰς φῶς ἀχθεῖσα, δαπάνῃ μὲν φιλευσεβοῦς τινος καὶ Ὀρθοδόξου, ἐπιμελείᾳ δὲ τοῦ Ἱερολογιωτάτου Κύρου Ἐφραὶμ, Τοῦ ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν, τοῦ καὶ Ἱεροκήρυκος νῦν ἐν Κύπρῳ χρηματίζοντος* (Venice: 1754). The author of the latter work, Blessed Makarios Kalogeras (1688–1737), celebrated January 19 and educated at Constantinople, was a hierodeacon and teacher of Patmos where he directed the patriarchal school. His sermons for the liturgical year were collected in the work cited above and published posthumously by Ephraim the Athenian, who was the abbot of the monastery of the Theotokos at Kykkos, Cyprus, and later became archbishop of Nazareth and patriarch of Jerusalem. This summary is based on Émile Legrand, *Δακικαὶ ἐφημερίδες: Éphémerides daces ou Chronique de la guerre de quatre ans (1736-1739) par Constantin Dapontè* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1888), 3: xii–xiii. See also Émile Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonée des ouvrages publiès par des grecs au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris: Libraire Garnier Frères, 1918), 1:431–432; Ναυκράτιος Τσουλκανάκης, *Ὁ Μέγας Διδάσκαλος τοῦ Γένους Ἅγιος Μακάριος ἱεροδιάκονος Καλογερᾶς (+1737): ὁ Πάτμιος εὐαγγελιστὴς τῆς παιδείας τοῦ νέου ἑλληνισμοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: n.p., 1994); and Γιώργος Κουτζακιώτης, "'Η Εἴδησις τῶν τάξεων τῶν μουράτων' καὶ ἡ πρόσληψη τοῦ τεκτονισμοῦ ἀπὸ τὸν οἰκουμενικὸ πατριάρχη Καλλίνικο Γ'," *Ὁ Ἐρανιστής* 28 (2011): 161–199.

is read at the end of the service of Matins, either in order for it to follow the "burial" of the Lord on the holy table after His "carrying out" at the end of the doxology, or from the strong influence of the "asmatic"/parish Typikon during which the gospel reading of Matins was read at the end of the service after the doxology, just as it precisely takes place on Great Saturday.[469]

In the well-known place for the readings, namely, prior to the fiftieth psalm, "a reading is placed."[470] The Typikon of Saint Sabas and the Triōdion agree verbatim. However, the rubric is worded so concisely that at first glance it leaves the impression that this is about the gospel pericope of the day: "Next [or 'after these things,'[471] namely, after the kathismata, 'In a clean linen and with divine spices…'[472] and 'The choirs of the angels were awestruck…'[473]] a reading is done on the Gospel according to Matthew 'On the next day, which is, after the day of Preparation…' and immediately the fiftieth psalm."[474] It is without doubt that this does not mean the gospel pericope of Matthew 27:62–66, but the eighty-ninth hermeneutical sermon of Chrysostomos on the Gospel according to Matthew, which begins, "On the next day…Everywhere falsehood comes to grief over itself…."[475] If any doubt remained for us, the abundantly clear rubric of a variant of the original rubric in the *Codex Vatopediou 320 (931)* from the year 1346 dissolves it: "And a reading for an explanation of the word of the gospel of the day according to Matthew."[476]

---

469. For discussions of Great Saturday, see questions 207, 227, 265, 326, 357, 437, 438, 526, and 527.

470. "τίθεται ἀνάγνωσις."

471. "μετὰ ταῦτα."

472. "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀρώμασι θείοις…"

473. "Ἐξέστησαν χοροί, τῶν Ἀγγέλων…"

474. "Εἶτα γίνεται ἀνάγνωσις εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον 'Τῇ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν Παρασκευήν, καὶ εὐθὺς τὸν ν','" Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 345.

475. "Τῇ ἐπαύριον…Πανταχοῦ ἡ πλάνη ἑαυτῇ περιπίπτει…"

476. "Καὶ ἀνάγνωσις εἰς ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον λόγου τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου τῆς ἡμέρας."

And one detail for the lovers of variations among Typika: Two Typika of the twelfth century, of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem (*Codex Timiou Staurou 43*) and of the monastery of the Evergetis (*Codex Athens 788*) provide at this point of the service of Great Saturday the reading of the sermon of Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus, "What is this? Today great silence is on the earth...."[477] The Typikon of the monastery of the Savior of Messina from the year 1131 presents itself as more unique, which prescribes a reading of the same sermon from the "Panēgyrikon,"[478] but obviously by choice, "also a sermon of Saint Grēgorios of Nyssa and the Lord Leōn the Master,"[479] however, in another place, after the third ode of the canon (it does not provide for the amōmos and lamentations).[480] Finally, so as not to forget the two modern Typika that we used for the Saturday of Lazarus—according to the Typikon of Methodios the reading is done "in the simple Dasmaskēnos"[481] and according to the Typikon of the monastery of Dionysiou "on burial of the divine body of the Lord, which is found in Dasmaskēnos the prose-

477. "Τὶ τοῦτο; Σήμερον σιγὴ πολλὴ ἐν τῇ γῇ..." Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus, *Homily 3 on the Resurrection of Christ* (PG 43:439a–464d). For its use in the temple of the Resurrection, see Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:164. For its use at the monastery of the Evergetis, see Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 496–497.

478. A liturgical book containing sermons according to the festal calendar. For an extensive treatment, see Albert Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, Texte und Untersuchungen, 50–52/1-2 (Leipzig, Berlin: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, Akademie Verlag, 1937–1952).

479. The "Lord Leōn the Master" most likely refers to the Byzantine emperor Leōn VI the Wise (r. 886–912), who is credited with authoring homilies on the liturgical year. For a critical edition and discussion of the homilies, see Theodora Antonopoulou, ed., *Leonis VI Sapientis Imperatoris Byzantini* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008) and Theodora Antonopoulou, ed., *The Homilies of the Emperor Leo VI* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

480. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 243.

481. "εἰς τὸν ἁπλοῦν Δαμασκηνόν," Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 359.

writer." And in both cases the seventh sermon of the subdeacon Dasmaskēnos the Stoudite is understood, which begins, "Evils and temptations, whenever they happen...."[482] The Typika vary. However, unity is found in variety.

532

Is the gospel of Sunday Matins of the Sunday of Thomas read at the beautiful gate as a gospel reading for a feast of the Lord, or at the right side of the holy table as an eōthinon?[483]

Both these ways have their advocates and, naturally, their line of justification.

In the first place, it is indisputable that the "Sunday of Antipascha, namely, the touching by the holy apostle Thomas" is included among the feasts of the Lord. Consequently, it retains the features of feasts of the Lord when they coincide with Sunday. Namely, resurrectional elements are not chanted on it, "but all those of the feast," according to the Typikon of Saint Sabas, and "[we chant] the polyeleos on account of the feast of the Lord instead of the amōmos, we do not chant the evlogētaria...nor do we say the anabathmoi of the tone," again according to the rubrics of the same Typikon.[484]

However, at the same time, particularly on this feast of the Lord, the theme of Sunday, namely, the resurrectional character of the day, is also maintained. And this is the case not only because on it we celebrate one of the main appearances of the resurrected Christ and the confirmation of the truth of this fact even by the disbelieving disciple, but because it is set forth as the first and beginning of the

482. "Τὰ κακὰ καὶ οἱ πειρασμοὶ ὁποῦ συμβαίνουσιν...," Δαμασκηνὸς ὁ Στουδίτης, *Θησαυρὸς Δαμασκηνοῦ ὑποδιακόνου καὶ Στουδίτου τοῦ Θεσσαλονικέως, μετὰ τῆς προσθήκης ἐν τῷ τέλει καὶ ἑτέρων ἑπτὰ Λόγων ψυχωφελεστάτων καὶ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τοῦ Πάτερ ἡμῶν* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 2004), 110.

483. See also question 432, where Phountoulēs also discusses the Sunday of the Antipascha.

484. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 358. This edition does not contain the rubrics cited above regarding the evlogētaria or the anabathmoi.

Sundays of the year. According to the Synaxarion, "we celebrate the inauguration of the Resurrection of Christ," namely, the repetition "eternally and upon eight days later" of the celebration of the Lord's Pascha, the Lord's Resurrection, namely, the day of the Lord. This Sunday is characterized by the Fathers, the Synaxarion, and the hymnography "as the first and mistress of days,"[485] which bears "also the representation of eternity, as the eighth day completing the future" (canon, ode seven, first troparion). In the synaxarion of the day, Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos[486] develops this theme in more detail: "Therefore, since of all things in life the Resurrection of the Lord especially is the greatest work and beyond all understanding, not only do we celebrate and inaugurate it every year, but also always upon eight days later. Accordingly, the present Sunday is a first inauguration, namely, it would be chiefly called both eighth and first; eighth as from Pascha, but first as the beginning of the others. And again eighth, because it is appointed in the image of that infinite day of the one in the future age, which shall in all ways be both a first and a single day, uninterrupted by night." But precisely for the existing character of it as Sunday to be shown and emphasized, and indeed of the first Sunday, it maintains elements of Sunday also along with elements of the feast of the Lord: the trinitarian canon in the Midnight Office and its resurrectional megalynaria at the end of the ninth ode (which is omitted according to the taxis only if a vigil is celebrated);[487] "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..."[488] prior to the fiftieth

485. "ὡς πρώτη ἡμερῶν καὶ κυρία." The word "κυρία, ἡ" appears to be used in the sense of one who has power and authority. This term is the feminine equivalent of "lord" (κύριος, ὁ).

486. Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos (d. ca. 1335) was a priest of Saint Sophia and made significant contributions to hymnology, to the interpretation of liturgical texts, as well as to the composition of prayers and synaxaria, and wrote a church history, the surviving text of which extends to the seventh century, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 705.

487. Phountoulēs is emphasizing that the omission of resurrectional Midnight Office megalynaria would be due to the standard rubrics governing a vigil, not to the fact it is the Sunday of Thomas.

488. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."

psalm; and the troparia "By the intercessions of the apostles..."[489] and "Jesus having risen from the grave..."[490] at the end of "Holy is the Lord..."[491] prior to the exaposteilarion. We encounter more elements of the resurrectional service of Sundays in the older Typika, which shows that the easier and more popular historical subject of the day, namely, the touching of Thomas, gained ground against the more difficult theological subject, of Sunday. For example, we refer to the fact that the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the first tone is prescribed in the Typikon of the Savior of Messina from the year 1131,[492] "the anabathmoi of the first tone and its prokeimenon" by the Typikon of the Evergetis,[493] "You are blessed above all, O Virgin Theotokos..."[494] at "Both now..."[495] of the lauds by the Typikon of the Savior,[496] and the antiphons of Sunday ("It is good to acknowledge the Lord...,"[497] "The Lord reigned...,"[498] and "O come, let us rejoice in the Lord..."[499]) by both the above Typika[500] as well

489. "Ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων..."

490. "Ἀναστὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου..."

491. "Ἅγιος Κύριος..."

492. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 257.

493. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 538–539. However, there is a slight difference in the texts. The text above reads, "οἱ ἀναβαθμοὶ τοῦ α' ἤχου καὶ τὸ προκείμενον αὐτοῦ," while the latter has, "οἱ ἀναβαθμοὶ τοῦ α' ἤχου καὶ τὸ προκείμενον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἤχου."

494. "Ὑπερευλογημένη ὑπάρχεις. Θεοτόκε Παρθένε..."

495. "Καὶ νῦν..."

496. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 257.

497. "Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ..."

498. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν..."

499. "Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα τῷ Κυρίῳ..."

500. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 540–541; Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 257.

as by the Typikon of the Great Church from the ninth–tenth century.[501] This latter one also knows the "ancient" koinōnikon of the day, "Praise the Lord from the heavens..."[502] of Sunday, which was chanted in parallel with the "new one," "Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem...,"[503] that of the feast. Conversely, the ancient Typika did not provide for "Holy is the Lord..." prior to the exaposteilaria.

Concerning now the gospel reading of Matins, all the sources characterize it as "the first eōthinon gospel reading" or "the first resurrectional eōthinon gospel reading," or "the first resurrectional eōthinon gospel reading according to Matthew," which is none other than the pericope, Matthew 28:16–20, namely, the first of the series of the eleven eōthina gospels. It does not refer to the touching of Thomas, the subject of the feast of the Lord, but to the subject of Sunday, the Resurrection. Moreover, from this Sunday, as from first of the Sundays, the yearly cycle of the sequence of eleven eōthina and eight tones begins. The fact that according to the modern taxis, the first antiphon of the fourth tone and the special prokeimenon of the feast ("Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem...,") are chanted does not constitute a reason that could support the position that the gospel reading must be characterized as a gospel of the feast and not of the Sunday. The modern Typika correctly prescribe that "the entire taxis for the eōthinon gospel" is observed. Namely, it is read according to the correct old taxis by the priest with a white phelonion to the right of the holy table and the kissing[504] follows during the chanting of the fiftieth psalm. The "taxis" of the eōthinon gospel constitutes the most basic element of the resurrectional service of Sunday. What kind of first Sunday would it be if it lacked the eōthinon resurrectional gospel?

501. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2:108, also for the remaining citations in the paragraph.

502. "Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν..."

503. "Ἐπαίνει Ἰερουσαλὴμ τὸν Κύριον..."

504. This refers to the veneration of the Gospel book by kissing its cover that displays an image of the Resurrection.

533

At "It is good to acknowledge the Lord and to make music to your name, O Most High, in order to declare your mercy in the morning and your truth every night"[505] of Matins, must the phrase "every night"[506] be replaced with "every day"[507]?

As is well known, this phrase originates from Psalm 91 (verses 2–3) of the Psalter and is used in divine worship as a "prokeimenon" at the end of the monastic Matins prior to the trisagion, which concludes it in instances where the great doxology is not chanted. The correction of "every night" to "every day" is not attested to either by the manuscripts or by the printed editions but is done by some in the context of the attempt in some manner for modernization of the prayer and its adaptation to the actual timing realities of the service. While Matins is a nocturnal service in the monasteries, it is a morning one in the parishes. If "every night" fits there since we are at least at the end of the nighttime, in parishes we are at the beginning of the day. Consequently, "every night" is considered ill-timed. Analogous adaptations are done by some with the modification or omission of "evening" or "morning [prayer]" in the plērōtika, concerning which we discussed in another answer.[508] At the time we were absolutely negative for reasons of principle, namely, not only for the arbitrary meddling in the liturgical texts, but also for more substantive reasons. Namely, for the superficial treatment of the transfer of evening services to the morning and morning services to the evening and for the false illusion of its solution with the change of two words, while the entirety of the service remains an evening or morning one. We could also repeat the same thing in the case of our question. However, here there are also other, even more serious reasons, which make the correction unacceptable and superficial.

505. "Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ψάλλειν τῷ ὀνόματι σου, Ὕψιστε, τοῦ ἀναγγέλειν τὸ πρωῒ τὸ ἔλεος σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου κατὰ νύκτα" (Psalm 91:2–3). The translation of the verse is taken from NETS. An alternate translation of "make music" could also be "sing" or "chant."

506. "κατὰ νύκτα."

507. "καθ' ἑκάστην."

508. See question 195.

"It is good to acknowledge..." is not simply a diaconal command for prayer, such as "Let us complete our evening prayer to the Lord..."[509] and so forth, which is found adapted to the various services depending on the time of their celebration. Here, this is a biblical phrase, verses of a psalm, which are selected in order to give meaning with their divinely inspired gravity to the synaxis and to the prayer of the community, when interpreted correctly and not modified according to one's whim. According to patristic interpretation, "in the morning [instead of the day] ...and...every night" are taken as signifying the ceaseless praise of God throughout the duration of the day and night. Saint Athanasios the Great comments, "he says that he proclaims praise and professes to repeat this both day and night (ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτός) ceaselessly for the things that the Only-begotten has brought to pass. And what else has He brought to pass than the Resurrection He prepared for us?"[510] Or, as Blessed Nikolaos Kabasilas observes, "he says that it is necessary during the day and night (ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός) to hymn God. For this is 'in the morning' (πρωΐ) and 'every night' (κατὰ νύκτα). As he says elsewhere, 'at all times' (ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ)[511]" (*On the Divine Liturgy*, 17).[512] Thus, this psalmic phrase at the end of the eōthinē doxology interconnects Matins and Vespers, just as the corresponding one of Vespers ("Now let your servant depart...")[513] interconnects the evening and morning service.

But in any case, even if these verses are taken as referring to the morning prayer of the Church, as we saw at the beginning, and "every night" is considered ill-timed, again its replacement with "every day" is unfortunate. First, it creates a tautology: "in the morning" (πρωΐ) (synecdochically, "day/ἡμέρα") and "every day"

509. "Πληρώσωμεν τὴν ἑσπερινὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ..."

510. PG 27:404c. On this work, see Giovanni Maria Vian, *Testi Inediti dal Commento al Salmi di Atanasio*, Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 14 (Roma: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1978) and G.C. Stead, "St. Athanasius on the Psalms," *Vigilae Christianae* 39 (1985): 65–78.

511. Psalm 33:2.

512. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 17.9 (SC 4bis:136).

513. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις..."

(καθ' ἑκάστην) is the same thing. Second, when the replacement is done during the large synaxes of Great Week, which are celebrated as is well known during the early evening hours like a small vigil for the convenience of the people (and almost only then is "It is good to acknowledge the Lord..." heard in parishes), it is neither morning nor day, but night. Therefore, for this arbitrary "modernization" to perhaps be successful, a way would have to be sought to replace the phrase "in the morning" (πρωΐ) and not "every night" (κατὰ νύκτα). These things are written not for a new cause of replacements to be given in the disputed phrase, but to reveal the inappropriateness of the matter and to demonstrate where such or similar meddling in the sacred liturgical texts can lead us.

534

During the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, are the canons of the Oktōēchos chanted just as the Triōdion prescribes or only that of the Cross as the Typikon prescribes?

An occasion was also given for us in the past to determine a difference between the Triōdion and Typikon, which is attributed to the more ancient and precise tradition followed by the former and to the development in the meantime and simplification that is applied in the latter.

According to the Typikon of Saint Sabas, on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, just as on every Sunday of the Triōdion, the three canons of the Paraklētikē (resurrectional, stauroanastasimos, and of the Theotokos) are chanted in six troparia and that of the Cross in eight.[514] The rubric that precedes the chanting of the canons in the Triōdion repeats the same thing with a small error (it has eight troparia instead of the canons of the tone in six), as also do the ancient and modern monastic Typika (Evergetis, Messina, Dionysiou, Xēropotamou, Methodios, and so forth). The two most

514. "εἰς ς'" and "εἰς η'" are translated "in six troparia" and "in eight troparia" respectively. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 307.

ancient Typika, those of the Evergetis and of the Savior of Messina, present insignificant differences as to the distribution of the troparia, which inversely provide the canons of the Paraklētikē in five troparia and of the Triōdion in six. Indisputably, this is the correct taxis, not only because the ancient and the precise modern Typika require it, but because it is required by the same structure and prescriptions for the services of Sundays. An omission of the resurrectional canon and the other elements of the Sunday service is not justified in any manner on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, which preserves integral its resurrectional character and consequently the use of the Oktōēchos. This is not about a feast of the Lord.

For the first time, as far as I know, the omission of the canons of the Paraklētikē is encountered in the Typikon of Kōnstantinos, is repeated by the Typikon of Violakēs, and is adopted by the modern *Calendar-Typika.*[515] This was obviously done intentionally and not by an oversight and was intended at reducing the length of the long service, which becomes lengthier due to the Veneration of the Cross. The Sunday prior to the Nativity of Christ established the model, according to which the resurrectional canon of the Paraklētikē, the stauroanastasimos canon, and the canon of the Theotokos are omitted, and only the two canons of the Mēnaion are chanted. The first according to "In the waves of the sea..."[516] has a resurrectional one as its first troparion, just as precisely also the canon of the Veneration of the Cross. Thus, this makes up for the absence of the resurrectional canon. The solution, in the era when the canons were chanted, was clever, but certainly not precise. Strictness remains for the monasteries as long as they are not influenced by intrusions according to oikonomia that are done in the Typika of the parishes. It is an open secret that not even the abridgment by this oikonomia could prevent the spoiling of the canons. I wonder in how many

515. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 221; Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 341; *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

516. "Κύματι θαλάσσης...," which is the prosomoion.

parish temples this year, was even the one canon of the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross chanted, whole and in eight troparia, as the Typikon prescribes?

We spoke about the "model" of the Sunday prior to the Nativity of Christ, which was followed here. The comparison is not entirely identical. From the beginning, the service was developed in the former without a resurrectional canon, and for this reason the first canon has "In the waves of the sea..." as an heirmos but adapted to the forefeast theme of the day. The katabasies of Pascha are heirmoi for the canon of the Cross, which are improper to be chanted prior to the odes of the canon. For this reason, also, the Typikon of Kōnstantinos rushes to prescribe: "The heirmos twice. 'The most divine Moses long ago prefigured...,'"[517] which, however, is not the heirmos of the canon, but the "katabasia in the same tone and heirmos"[518] (namely of "It is the day of the Resurrection"[519]), as the Triōdion correctly explains. The Typikon of the Evergetis does not name "The most divine Moses...," and so forth, as heirmoi, but as "proseirma"[520] ("At the end, both choirs say the proseirma, 'The most divine Moses...'").[521] In modern Typika, it is usually not specified that when writing "heirmos" they mean the "proseirma" or the katabasies, and it is possible for the Typika to cause confusion and, even in the middle of Great Lent, for the heirmoi of the Paschal canon to be heard.

517. "Ὁ θειότατος προετύπωσεν...," Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 221.

518. "καταβασία εἰς ἦχον καὶ εἱρμὸν τὸν αὐτόν."

519. "Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα..."

520. "πρόσειρμα."

521. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 406–407.

535

Why are the resurrectional evlogētaria not chanted on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross?

The answer to this question presupposes the knowledge of the relationship between the evlogētaria and the amōmos, regarding which we also discussed in the past, as well as the development of this point of the service of Sunday Matins, which is long and complex. We summarize these points by recalling perhaps largely well-known points, but necessary ones for the search for our correct position on the question above.

1. The evlogētaria, resurrectional or funereal, are stichēra of the kathisma of the amōmos (seventeenth kathisma) in the Matins of Sundays and those Saturdays during which "Alleluia" is chanted respectively. As is well known, the service of Sunday has three kathismata in Matins: the second, third, and seventeenth (namely, the amōmos, Psalm 118). If the amōmos is not chanted with stichologia, a chanting of evlogētaria is not inherently understood, namely, "stichēra of the amōmos" or "troparia of the amōmos," as they are called in the sources. However, the converse does not apply; whenever the amōmos is chanted with stichologia, the evlogētaria are not necessarily chanted. For example, on Saturdays, where the "Alleluia" is not chanted, but rather "God is the Lord...,"[522] the funereal evlogētaria are not chanted after the stichologia of the amōmos. Similarly, during the service of the daily Midnight Office, although the amōmos is chanted with stichologia, it is not accompanied with evlogētaria, because here this is not a case of a kathisma. In the funereal and memorial services (funereal vigils), the amōmos is chanted with stichologia[523] and the funereal evlogētaria are chanted because this is in imitation of Matins. The Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem (*Codex T. Staurou 43*, from the year 1122) provides the amōmos also for Palm Sunday with special "resurrectional troparia of the amōmos of the feast" (three of the feast of Palm Sunday and three resurrectional, and the ordinary ones at the

522. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."
523. "στιχολογεῖται."

Glory both now).[524] The significance of this rubric, which at first glance is unrelated to our subject, will be immediately apparent. Finally, the Typikon of the monastery of Saint Sabas, on which the Typikon in use is essentially based, well known for its brevity, regarding which we spoke in a recent answer,[525] is clear that when it prescribes the particulars in the stichologia of Sunday Matins and says, "the customary stichologia follows"[526] or "the stichologia,"[527] it means the three kathismata of Sunday (second, third, and seventeenth) together with the evlogētaria. The rubric self-evident for that era, when it ceased to be "self-evident," became a cause for various misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

2. The stichologia of the amōmos together with the evlogētaria, which as it appears were chanted at a slow pace, just as nowadays during the service of the Epitaphios, lasted for a long time. This was also owed to the uncustomary length of the psalm (176 verses) and to the manner of its stichologia. The psalm was chanted by verse antiphonally, just as more or less nowadays the fiftieth psalm is chanted during the service of Sunday Matins, by verse with an ephymnion "Alleluia" and in the plagal of the first, namely, in the tone of the evlogētaria. A plainer manner of its chanting by one choir or by all the brothers together would resemble the melodic recitation of the two royal psalms (nineteen and twenty) during the services of Matins of Great Week, as more or less is done nowadays in our parish temples. It is self-evident that the chanting of the amōmos and the evlogētaria lasted for a very long time. Especially when it was chanted according to the former manner, it is questionable whether one hour or more was sufficient. A vigil took place on Sundays in the monasteries. This is gathered from the witnesses of the Typika, but also from the very Paraklētikē in use itself, where for every Saturday Vespers a Small and Great Vespers is provided, namely, elements of a vigil. Consequently, ample time existed for the chanting of all the individual component elements of the long service, namely of Great

524. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:6.
525. See questions 530 and 531.
526. "ἐφεξῆς ἡ συνήθης στιχολογία."
527. "ἡ στιχολογία."

Vespers: the kathismata, the stichologia of the odes and canons, the readings, and this stichologia of the amômos according to the above form. The Divine Liturgy was celebrated, after a break, on Sunday morning between the third and sixth hour (9:00 p.m. up until 12:00 noon in modern time).

In this manner, the service of the ordinary Sundays of the year was carried out in the monasteries. However, two instances presented a difficulty. First, when a feast of the Mother of God or a commemoration of a celebrated great saint coincided on a Sunday, in which case the polyeleos and eklogê of the feast were intercalated according to the taxis, and secondly during the summer months "on account of the brevity of the night."[528] In both instances, the length of the service exceeded the customary limits, namely, the natural start of the day, during which the service of the vigil ought to conclude.

The Typikon of the monastery of the Evergetis presents itself as flexible and radical in the second instance. From the Second Sunday of the Fast, the omission of the amômos begins ("on account of the night becoming less, from now, we do not chant the amômos"),[529] which lasts up until the commemoration of the Beheading of the Honorable Forerunner if it coincides with a Sunday. During the feast of the Dormition of the Theotokos, just as also on the first Sundays of the Triôdion, for the same reason again, it offers an al-

528. On Mount Athos nowadays, so-called "Byzantine time" is preserved in most monasteries. Every Saturday evening for the Vespers of Sunday, clocks are adjusted to the "Twelfth Hour of the day" at sunset. In the summertime, this could effectively be at 8:00 or 9:00 p.m. By custom, the Midnight Office always begins at the Sixth Hour of the night (six hours after sunset), so in the summertime naturally, this can be between 2:00 and 3:00 a.m. However, sunrise for example in June (in the Northern Hemisphere) will follow only a few hours after the Midnight Office. Sunrise is usually the First Hour of the day. Accordingly, not much time is left for a vigil, "on account of the brevity of the night." Small Vespers customarily follows after the Ninth Hour, which is three hours before sunset. Consequently, starting the vigil earlier becomes problematic.

529. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 394–395.

ternative solution: to chant by free choice one of the two, either the amōmos or the polyeleos, or to chant both.[530]

The Typikon of Saint Sabas, with which the Typikon of the Savior of Messina also agrees, seems to be indifferent both regarding the length of the service after the addition of the polyeleos as well as the night's brevity during the spring and summer months. It stereotypically repeats the rubrics, "the customary stichologia"[531] or "the customary stichologiai,"[532] meaning, as we said, the two kathismata and the amōmos, and adds "also the polyeleos." It very rarely clarifies that the amōmos is also implied in "all the customary stichologia."[533] However, the vagueness gave rise to this rubric being interpreted to mean an omission of the amōmos and the evlogētaria when a polyeleos is chanted. This precisely happens in the case of the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross. The Typikon of Saint Sabas prescribes: "the customary stichologia and polyeleos."[534] The Typikon of Kōnstantinos nearly repeats the same things: "the Psalter and the polyeleos."[535] The Typikon of Violakēs, repeats the rubric of the Typikon of Kōnstantinos, but adds in a footnote, "evlogētaria are not said."[536] In this way, the misinterpretation of this unclear rubric of the Typikon of Saint Sabas was formalized. It was considered self-evident that the amōmos is omitted, and consequently its resurrectional evlogētaria/stichēra as well. Conversely, the modern Typika of the Holy Mountain remain faithful, as was expected, to

530. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 260–261.

531. "ἡ συνήθης στιχολογία."

532. "αἱ συνήθεις στιχολογίαι."

533. "ἐξ ἔθους ἅπασαν στιχολογίαν."

534. " ἡ συνήθης στιχολογία καὶ ὁ πολυέλεος," *Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 307.

535. "τὸ Ψαλτήριον καὶ ὁ πολυέλεος," Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 221.

536. "εὐλογητάρια οὐ λέγονται," Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 341 n. 25.

the old and correct practice, applying an intermediate, but more precise practice. In instances where a polyeleos is intercalated, even on feasts of the Mother of God, while they omit the stichologia of the amōmos in order to shorten the length of the service, they retain the resurrectional evlogētaria, and, in some manner, replacing the amōmos with the polyeleos. This is also precisely provided for regarding the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, when placing the evlogētaria "immediately"[537] after the first and second stichologia, the polyeleos, and the eklogē (Typika of Dionysiou, Xēropotamou, Methodios, and so forth). And correctly, because on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, just as also on feasts of the Mother of God, regarding which as we said the same taxis applies, the Sunday's resurrectional character is not removed, which is especially displayed by the resurrectional evlogētaria. The omission of the amōmos is purely owed to "technical" causes and not to theoretical reasons, namely, the excessive length that the service assumed with the addition of the polyeleos.

In the parish Typika, I think that the omission of the evlogētaria on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross and in all similar instances is unjustified. In any case, invoking the length of the service, neither the kathismata, nor the polyeleos, nor even the amōmos are recited with stichologia. This practice is implemented in the parishes likely from the application also to them, namely, the prevalence, of the monastic Typikon. Even if officially we do not wish to admit it nowadays, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, an excellent expert in the precision of the Typikon, but also in the conditions of the parishes and of the parish worship of his era, testifies: "on account of those in the world not having the strength to perform everything; for they do not say the Psalter, except only during Holy and Great Week" (*Dialogue*, chapters 302–303).[538] They have already unbound—rightly or wrongly— the evlogētaria, funereal or resurrectional, in parish practice from the amōmos, as well as the kathismata troparia from the kathismata of the Psalter. However, possibly, especially for the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, the parallel of the feast of the

537. "εὐθέως."
538. PG 155:556d.

Exaltation also contributed, the eklogē of which is chanted during the Third Sunday of the Fast. However, there, this is a case of a feast of the Lord, which when it coincides with Sunday, "none of the resurrectional elements is chanted." However, here, the dominant subject is the Resurrection, the subject of Sunday. The Veneration of the Precious Cross comes as a secondary subject, thematically subordinate and historically later.

The question of chanting the polyeleos and evlogētaria during the feasts of the Mother of God, when they coincide with Sunday and other instances, occupied the oikonomos of blessed memory, Father Geōrgios Rēgas, in *Questions of the Typikon*, Athens 1954, pp. 30–34, ("The kathismata of Sunday Matins")[539] as well as Geōrgios Bekatōros of eternal memory in *Taxis of the Sacred Services* of the year 1973 (pp. 7–16).[540] They came to different conclusions. The former is in favor of chanting the evlogētaria, while the latter is in favor of their omission (see also *Taxis of the Sacred Services 1951*, p. 14).[541] The retrospection above proved that the position of Father Rēgas is more correct.

536

Why is the twelfth gospel reading of the service of the Holy Passions read by the deacon from the ambōn and "Glory to you, O Lord, glory to you"[542] is chanted at the end, while the eleven preceding readings are read by the priest from the beautiful gate and "Glory to your forbearance, O Lord, glory to you"[543] is chanted at their conclusion?

The observation is accurate and the question reasonable. The simplest answer is that it was probably in this way considered appropriate for the conclusion of the long service to be indicated, by

539. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 30–34.

540. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1973: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1973), 7–16.

541. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1951: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1951), 14.

542. "Δόξα σοι, Κύριε, δόξα σοι."

543. "Δόξα τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σου, Κύριε, δόξα σοι."

returning to the customary manner of reciting the gospel reading and to the doxological conclusion well-known from other instances. But while this answer seemingly solves the matter, yet effectively it complicates the question. And this is because the gospel reading is read by the deacon, and from the ambōn, only during the Divine Liturgy, probably due to the size of the synaxis, namely, for reasons purely acoustical, while in all other instances by the priest. Should it be considered here as an imitation of the manner of reading during the Divine Liturgy, so "Glory to you, O Lord...," which concludes it, can be explained in this manner? Moreover, "Glory to your forbearance, O Lord..." fits into the service of the Holy Passions and it is indeed curious that it is abandoned at the last reading. I think that the pious interpretation does not hold ground that this pericope (Matthew 27:62–66) refers to the events after the Lord's passion and therefore His forbearance is no longer rightly praised. Other pericopes from the twelve gospels of service of the Holy Passions are not narrating events of the Savior's passions as well (First, John 13:31–18:1; Tenth, Mark 15:43–47; Eleventh, John 19:38–42) and yet they conclude with "Glory to your forbearance...," while inversely other pericopes refer to the passion, without concluding in the manner above, but with the customary, "Glory to you, O Lord..." (gospel reading for the Liturgy of Great Thursday, for the Hours and Vespers of Great Friday, for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross). "Glory to your forbearance..." fits, as we said, into the service of the Holy Passions and is only chanted during the first eleven gospel readings, which all, as well as the twelfth, in the narrower or broader sense refer to the Lord's holy passions.

These idiosyncrasies that we observe in the manner of reading (deacon, ambōn) and in the conclusion ("Glory to you, O Lord...") of the twelfth gospel reading of the Holy Passions must have deeper causes, which trace back to the very structure of the service and the stages of its development. Namely, it is a kind of connection joint of a later element, of a subsequent addition to the original service, which, as often happens, remained visible even after the addition. This is what occurs in all material and spiritual structures and in divine worship itself. Guided by these traces in our inquiries, it is

possible for us to arrive at the solution of similar problems, without the need for us to resort to impromptu subjective interpretations, which give only a superficial solution, for the most part arbitrary and unhistorical.

The service of Matins of Great Friday or "the service of the Holy and Undefiled Passions of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[544] as it is titled in our liturgical books, or more simply and popularly, "the twelve gospels,"[545] gradually developed until it arrived at its present form. The most characteristic element of its development, which directly concerns us in our inquiry, is that it did not have twelve, but eleven gospel readings. As paradoxical as this may seem to us nowadays, it is true, both because it is attested to by the manuscript tradition and because this reason requires it, namely, the theoretical conception of this form of service. This sequence of gospel readings for the holy passions is linked, but also partially dependent on, a parallel form of pericopes, of the sequence of the resurrectional eōthina Sunday gospel readings for the liturgical year. The parallel examination of the developmental course of the two systems of pericopes of the passion and resurrectional, elucidates both and gives the correct answer to our question.

Especially regarding Great Friday and its services, a massive study has been written by the Spanish professor Sebastià Janeras with the title, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique Byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices*, Rome: 1988.[546]

With the reading of a series of pericopes from the sacred gospels during the synaxes of Great Friday, the narration of the events is sought, which relate to the saving passion according to its authentic witnesses, namely, the sacred evangelists. The same thing is also done with the selection of the relevant pericopes from the epistles of the Apostle Paul, the prophets of the Old Testament, and the Psalter, where a possibility existed of an elective reading of an epistle,

544. "ἀκολουθία τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων Παθῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ."

545. "τὰ δώδεκα εὐαγγέλια."

546. Sebastià Janeras, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique Byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices*, Studia Anselmiana 99, Analecta Liturgica 12 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1988).

prophecy, or a chanting of psalms, such as in the service of Great Hours or Vespers. Already from the period of the pilgrim Aetheria (end of the fourth century), it is attested that this was done during the synaxes of Great Friday at the Holy Places.[547] After the crystallization of the well-known form of monastic services, this diffuse biblical material was subjected to standardized liturgical forms and, over the course of time, provided us the liturgical forms of services prevailing today with all their relevant particular features for this sacred day: Matins (service of the Holy Passions), Great Hours, and the Vespers of the Unnailing. The gospel pericopes of the passion were distributed among them, depending on the specifications that existed in each service, always aiming at the detailed description of the passion according to the sacred evangelists. And since there are four of them, the most natural thing would be for an equal number of gospel passages to be read that cover the narratives of the four gospels. This is obvious in the present services of the Great Hours, in which the gospel readings precisely respond to this call and follow the traditional sequence of the gospels: First Hour – Matthew, Third Hour – Mark, Sixth Hour – Luke, Ninth Hour – John. With the

547. *Itinerarium Egeriae* in *Égérie, Journal de Voyage*, ed. and trans. Pierre Maraval, SC 296 (Paris: Cerf, 1982). This fourth century writing is a travelogue of a woman's pilgrimage to Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor. The writing is divided into two parts: a diary of the pilgrimage and a description of services in Jerusalem. Phountoulēs's attribution of this work to Aetheria reflects the scholarly discussion at the time of his writing. Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship to a writer known as Egeria and titles the work *Itinerarium Egeriae*. Speculation regarding the author's homeland includes Aquitaine, Gallia Narbonensis, southern Gaul, and Galicia. Aside from recently discovered fragments, the work is contained in one surviving eleventh century manuscript, the *Codex Aretinus 405*. This discussion is based on Anne McGowan and Paul F. Bradshaw, trans., *The Pilgrimage of Egeria, A New Translation of the Itinerarium Egeriae with Introduction and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press Academic, 2018) and George E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*, Ancient Christian Writers, no. 38 (New York: Newman Press, 1970). Additional information may be found in John Wilkinson, trans., *Egeria's Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1999) and Victor Parra-Guinaldo, "Itinerarium Egeriae: A Retrospective Look and Preliminary Study of a New Approach to the Issue of Authorship-provenance," *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 7 (2019): 13–21.

same rationale, a parallel sequence was created with four extended pericopes according to the four evangelists—witnesses of the Resurrection—for the story of the narratives of the sacred gospels during the Resurrection and appearances of the risen Christ. This is the maternal format for the sequence of eōthina Sunday gospels, which survives up until nowadays together with the sequence of the four gospel readings of the passion in the Armenian liturgical form ("Gospels of the Myrrhbearers"), well known for its conservatism and insistence on most ancient worship forms and traditions.

The obvious disadvantage of this otherwise simple and correct system, was the length of the pericopes, which definitely made the reading long and tiresome. There also existed another difficulty in the resurrectional pericopes, namely, the unevenness in the length of the narratives of the evangelists, chiefly of the more extended narratives of John and Luke versus the briefer ones of Matthew and Mark (John, chapter 20 – 31 verses, chapter 21 – 25 verses; Luke, chapter 24 – 53 verses; Matthew, chapter 28 – 20 verses; Mark, chapter 16 – 20 verses). Thus, it appears that early on, another distribution into smaller and more numerous pericopes was preferred. It is very likely that the start was made from the resurrectional readings, where the new number was also provided on the basis of precisely the same criterion. The evangelists/witnesses of the Resurrection are four, but the first real witnesses were eleven according to Matthew 28:16, 17 ("The eleven disciples went to Galilee...and seeing Him..."). The pericopes also became eleven (so also the resurrectional pericopes that were read according to the ancient taxis in Jerusalem during Renewal Week) according to the number of the eleven apostles. The later explanation is incorrect that so many appearances of the Resurrected One were counted, because the number of appearances is much more, and the pericopes did not narrate only one appearance each. According to this model, the distribution of the pericopes for the passion was also done. During the service of the Matins/vigil of Great Friday, the individual smaller pericopes were read, being distributed at various points of the services, more methodically now since the cycle of chanting and reading was henceforth smoother. This taxis is attested to by ancient sources and Evangelistaria. In the

relatively later ones, the twelfth pericope is also added with the note: "One must know that the twelfth gospel reading is not presently[548] said, but on Holy and Great Saturday morning" (*Sinai 754* from the year 1177). Indeed, the twelfth gospel reading of the holy passions (Matthew 27:62–66) is the original gospel for the Matins of Great Saturday and refers to the events that happened on it ("on the next day, namely, after the day of Preparation"), and it is encountered in this place nowadays and in all the ancient Evangelistaria. A reversal is done in later ones: it is indicated as a twelfth gospel reading for the Holy Passions and there exists the note "a twelfth gospel reading was appointed for the Passions" (*Codex Patmos 70*).

It cannot be chronologically determined when the gospel reading of Matins for Great Saturday became a twelfth gospel reading for the Holy Passions, while preserving at the same time also its ancient place during Great Saturday. The Typikon of the Great Church from the ninth–tenth century (*Codices Patmos 266, T. Staurou 40*) has twelve gospels "for the all-night vigil of the Passions" (it does not have Great Hours).[549] The Evangelistarion noted above (*Patmos 70*), which similarly has twelve gospels, is traced back to the tenth century. Conversely, the Typikon of the Evergetis (*Codex Athens 788* from the twelfth century) notes: "for the twelfth gospel reading is read in the Matins."[550] Namely, it has only eleven gospel readings in the service of the Holy Passions, just as also the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem (*Codex T. Staurou 43* from the year 1122).[551] Finally, according to the Typikon of the monastery of the Savior of Messina (*Codex Messina 115* from the year 1131), the twelfth gospel reading is also read at the conclusion of the service, after the apolytikion and prior to the dismissal, a matter that

548. "ἀρτίως."

549. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:76–79

550. "τὸ γὰρ ιβ' εὐαγγέλιον ἀναγινώσκεται ἐν τῷ ὄρθρῳ," Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 488–489. The quotation lacked the word "ἐπαύριον" (the next day) in the critical edition of the text.

551. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:116–147.

establishes even more apparently its later addition to the service.[552] Perhaps this was done piecemeal by locality, out of attraction for the closest sacred number, twelve, when the original reason for the preference of the number eleven (apostles, witnesses of the Resurrection) as well as the direct connection of the eleven gospels of the Passion to the eleven eōthina resurrectional gospels had been forgotten.

537

Is the "Alleluia" during the Matins of Great Lent always chanted in the plagal of the fourth tone or also in other tones?

The triple "Alleluia," which is chanted four times during the daily Matins of Great Lent as an ephymnion of the ode of Isaiah ("In the night my spirit eagerly seeks you...")[553] instead of "God is the Lord...,"[554] is always chanted in the Paraklētikē's tone of the week, the one "in order,"[555] or the "applicable tone"[556] according to the Typika. Namely, its chanting is specified by the trinitarian troparia of the tone of the week that are attached to the "Alleluia," just as precisely the tone of "God is the Lord..." during feasts as well as the remaining days of the year is specified by the tone of the apolytikia. This is a general rule. The psalms of lauds and of the Lamp-lighting (formerly also of the Hours and the odes of the canons) are chanted according to the tone of the troparia or of the first troparion or of the first canon (in the odes), which are attached to them.

Chanting "Alleluia" during Great Lent always in the plagal of the fourth tone is due either to ignorance or to the prevailing influence of Great Week or even of the funereal "Alleluia" of the Saturdays of Souls.[557] But there the troparia, "Behold, the bridegroom

552. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 237.

553. "Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ..."

554. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."

555. "τὸν ἐνόρδινο."

556. "τυχόντα ἤχον."

557. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 18.

comes...,"[558] "When the glorious disciples...,"[559] and "You who with profound wisdom...,"[560] are in the plagal of the fourth tone. Consequently, also in the instances above, the general rule is applied, which we noted above. It is noted correctly in modern printed editions that the "Alleluia" is chanted "in the tone of the week."[561] The false excuse that the plagal of the fourth tone is penitential, and for this reason appropriate, is ungrounded. It is probably preferred because it is better known. It is the easiest solution that invaded parishes and even some monasteries, wrongly of course.

538

Why is "O Virgin Theotokos..."[562] chanted in the Artoklasia? What relation has it with the blessing of the loaves?

As we also wrote in the past, the Artoklasia, in the form that it is celebrated nowadays in the parishes, is a modern service.[563] It appears from its structure that it was composed in a period of decline. It was compiled from a collection of older elements, more or less unrelated to each other, which come basically from the service of the monastic Great Vespers: the ektenēs, the Litē, and the blessing of loaves that is situated in the monastic vigil. The truly traditional sequence of these elements in Great Vespers is, as is well known: the ektenēs – "Vouchsafe"[564] –plērōtika – petitions – inclination – idiomela of the Litē – petitions of the Litē – inclination – "O merciful master..."[565] – aposticha – "Now let your servant depart..."[566] – trisagion and so forth – apolytikion – "O Virgin Theotokos..." – blessing of the loaves – "Blessed be the name of the Lord..."[567] three times –

558. "Ἰδοὺ ὁ νυμφίος ἔρχεται..."
559. "Ὅτε οἱ ἔνδοξοι μαθηταί..."
560. "Ὁ βάθει σοφίας..."
561. "εἰς τὸν ἦχον τῆς ἑβδομάδος."
562. "Θεοτόκε Παρθένε..."
563. See questions 271–273.
564. "Καταξίωσον."
565. "Δέσποτα πολυέλεε..."
566. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις..."
567. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..."

Psalm 33, "I will bless the Lord at all times...,"[568] up until verse 10 – "The rich became poor and hungry...,"[569] three times – "May the blessing of the Lord...."[570] Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki when commenting on this taxis, which is ancient and prevails up until nowadays, adds: "Therefore these things are celebrated if there is a vigil, but if there is not one, after the inclination, neither does a Litē nor a blessing of loaves takes place... they do not perform the blessing of the loaves because this was especially prescribed owing to the fatigue of the vigil, that the brothers after having obtained blessed bread of Christ and a small refreshment owing to the fatigue, thereafter, may have prayer for communion of the awesome Mysteries, and especially the clergy" (*Dialogue*, chapter 342).[571] Obviously, during the years of the Tourkokratia,[572] the blessing of the loaves, which had been introduced by the monks/fathers into the service "owing to the fatigue of the vigil," was detached from it and also transferred to the parishes. A special service also then developed, which initially was attached to Vespers, but later both to Matins and to the Divine Liturgy itself or was even celebrated independently. Namely, it lost its original practical purpose and place in the middle of the all-night office, but preserved its aim in some manner, which was and is the sanctification of the faithful through partaking of the blessed bread. The special "service" was also at the time compiled from preexisting liturgical material, but in another order, namely: apolytikion or the first idiomelon of the Litē – ektenēs (according to the model of the ektenēs of the Midnight Office and not of the Litē) with the entreaty "that this holy church and this city and every city and land be kept safe..."[573] – the prayer of inclination of the Litē, "O most merciful

568. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ..."
569. "Πλούσιοι ἐπτώχευσαν καὶ ἐπείνασαν..."
570. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου..."
571. PG 155:620a–620b. Phountoulēs did not specify the work and the chapter number in parenthesis after the quote, which are added above. In this case, he specified the chapter at the beginning of the quote, but incorrectly in also including chapter 341.
572. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.
573. "ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαφυλαχθῆναι τὴν ἁγίαν Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ταύτην, καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν..."

master..."[574] – "O Virgin Theotokos..." and the censing of the loaves during the latter just as in the vigil – the prayer of the Artoklasia, "who blessed the five loaves..."[575] – and the eleventh verse of Psalm 33, "The rich became poor and hungry...," three times. Namely, a relatively successful anthology. It would be more successful if the special and indeed beautiful petitions of the Litē were preserved, perhaps somewhat modified to suit parish conditions.

Now comes the answer to the question on its own. "O Virgin Theotokos..." is the theotokion of the Great Vespers of vigils, which is chanted instead of the theotokion of the tone of the apolytikion, when there is not a feast of the Lord. Certainly, it has nothing to do with the Artoklasia, or probably as much as also the ektenēs, the prayer of inclination, and the apolytikion that preceded. They are adjacent to the prayer for the blessing of the loaves, but essentially unrelated to this element of the service of Great Vespers. With an additional reason for its selection, that the censing of the loaves takes place during "O Virgin Theotokos...," just because it immediately preceded the prayer of their blessing. Saint Symeōn so also explains it in chapter 341 of the *Dialogue*: "The troparion of the feast is sung as well as 'O Virgin Theotokos...' with a louder-sounding melody. This is the archangel's utterance upon the Virgin's conception. Therefore, it is said since this beginning of the economy of salvation also has taken place on Sunday (as also the Resurrection). Indeed, on account of this, it is also said during the Sunday vigils and during feasts of the saints (apart from feasts of the Lord alone) because she is the leader of all the saints and holiness for the saints from her virginal childbirth."[576]

574. "Δέσποτα πολυέλεε..."
575. "ὁ εὐλογήσας τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους..."
576. PG 155:618a–618b.

539

Is it possible for the old Divine Liturgies of Saint Iakōvos, Markos, and so forth to be celebrated on any day whatsoever?[577]

There are many ancient Liturgies. Silvestros Syropoulos, who most probably is the subsequent Patriarch Sōphronios I of Constantinople (1463–1464), states, in the *Memoirs* or *Speeches* or *Collection* concerning the Council of Florence (1439) which he wrote, that the Easterners in their discussions with the Latins concerning the invocation of the Holy Spirit for the consecration of the precious gifts during the Divine Liturgy, called upon the authority of the Liturgies of the Churches of the East, "numbering more than two thousand" (10, 2).[578] The number (two thousand) is definitely exaggerated. In any case, there are many in the different languages (Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopian) of the Christian peoples of the East and in the Latin of the peoples of the West. Many of the eastern ones are derived from a translation of early Greek anaphoras into vernacular languages. Of these, the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, the Liturgy of

577. For texts and general discussions of the Liturgies referenced in the question, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θείαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994). For a critical edition of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, see B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 5–142. In addition, most recently, see Ἀλκιβιάδης Κ. Καξαμίας, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Θεοβαδίστου Ὄρους Σινά, Ἁγία Αἰκατερίνη, 2006), where there is a prologue by Phountoulēs and a critical review of prior editions. For a critical edition of the Liturgy of Saint Markos, see Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990).

578. Σίλβεστρος Συρόπουλος, *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* 10.2 in *Les Mémoires du grand ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439)*, ed. V. Laurent (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1971), 476. The erroneous citation of 10.3 is corrected above to 10.2. Silvestros Syropoulos (b. 1400–d. after 1453) was a member of the Byzantine delegation to the unionist Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) who recorded an account of the council. For a summary of recent scholarship dealing with Syropoulos, see F. Kondyli and V. Andriopoulou, eds., *Sylvester Syropoulos on Politics and Culture in the Fifteenth-Century Mediterranean*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies 16 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014).

Markos, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian, and the Presanctified of Saint Iakōvos are preserved in the original Greek language. The Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which is preserved in the book of the same name that is attributed to Clement, Pope of Rome, and the Liturgy of Saint Peter, which is a translation of the Roman one that was done and used in adaptation by the Italo-Greek communities of Southern Italy and Sicily, constitute special cases. The mystery of the Holy Eucharist was celebrated according to these ancient texts nearly up until the fourteenth century. Thus, the Church of Antioch/Jerusalem had the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos and the Presanctified by the same name, and that of Alexandria the Liturgies of Markos, Basileios the Great and Grēgorios the Theologian and the Presanctified of Saint Markos (which is not preserved). These Liturgies later fell into disuse when due to historical conditions the patriarchates of the East weakened. At the time, the Byzantine liturgical form spread and became prevalent in them with its well-known Liturgies of Basileios the Great (different from the Alexandrian), the sacred Chrysostomos, and the Presanctified. However, the old indigenous populations, who were already differentiated from the Orthodox (Melkites)—the Syrians and the Copts—preserved their ancient liturgical forms of the Churches of the East and celebrate them up until nowadays in their regional languages.

During modern times, a noteworthy effort for the revival of these ancient Liturgies of the East has taken place. Its start began with the Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem that bears the name of its first bishop Iakōvos the Brother of God, which enjoyed particular prestige and was considered the Apostle's work and a maternal format for the Byzantine Liturgies. Its various publications (Dionysios Latas, Chrysostomos Papadopoulos)[579] also took place, and it

579. Διονύσιος Λάτας, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἐνδόξου Ἀποστόλου Ἰακώβου, τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ Πρώτου Ἱεράρχου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ἐκδοθεῖσα μετὰ διαράξεως καὶ σημειώσεων* (Ζάκυνθος: τύποις Καψοκεφάλου, 1886). Χρυσόστομος Παπαδόπουλος, *Περὶ τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Λειτουργίας τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου τῶν Καταστημάτων Ἀνέστη Κωσταντινίδου, 1901). Dionysios Latas (Διονύσιος Λάτας) (1835–1894), archbishop of Zakynthos (1884–1894), a graduate of the Theological Schools

began to be celebrated in some places on the day of his commemoration (October 23) or the first Sunday after it or the Sunday after the Nativity of Christ. On a smaller scale, the same thing later took place with the Liturgies of Alexandria of the Evangelist Markos and Grēgorios the Theologian, as well as with the Jerusalemite Presanctified of Saint Iakōvos. In any case, the Liturgies of Basileios the Great and Grēgorios (the Alexandrian ones) have problems regarding a restoration of their text and taxis, because they survive in manuscripts that contain the priest parts, namely, the prayers, and not the diaconal parts, the people's responses, and the standard rubrics.

As we said, in Syria and Egypt up until the fourteenth century, these Liturgies were regularly celebrated just as the Byzantine Liturgies at Constantinople and in the eparchies of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. They were the traditional and standard Liturgies of these areas, which were crystalized through the centuries by their liturgical tradition. Outside of these areas, they are not known nor were allowed to ever replace the prevailing taxis. They are celebrated by exception, always with the permission of the local bishop or even by the latter, after necessary preparation of the celebrants and people, without amateurism and arbitrariness. Their celebration is manifoldly beneficial because they renew and kindle liturgical piety and the interest of the people, make us sharers of the manner of worship of other regions and eras, and make other liturgical forms of the Christian ecumene known to us. What became prevalent to be done regarding the Jerusalemite Liturgy, without being binding, namely, to

---

of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem and the University of Athens, known for his preaching, travelled throughout Europe and America, and published mainly collections of sermons (Ἰω. Χ. Κωνσταντινίδης, "Διονύσιος ὁ Λάτας," *ΘΗΕ* 5:45–47). Chrysostomos Papadopoulos (Χρυσόστομος Παπαδόπουλος) (1868–1938) was Archbishop of Athens and All Greece (r. 1923–1938), previously being a professor of general church history at the University of Athens (1914–1923). He was educated at the Seminary of Constantinople, the Theological School of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, the Evangelical School of Smyrna, the Theological School of the University of Athens, and the Theological Academies of Kiev and Saint Petersburg. He was responsible for major changes within the Church of Greece, including the adoption of the reformed Julian Calendar. The majority of his scholarly publications were concentrated in church history (Ἰω. Χ. Κωνσταντινίδης, "Χρυσόστομος," *ΘΗΕ* 12:417-420).

be celebrated associated with the commemoration of Saint Iakōvos, can also be extended to the Alexandrian ones, to be connected, for example, with the commemoration of the Apostle Markos, of Saint Grēgorios the Theologian, or the Alexandrian Fathers.

540

During the dismissal for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious and Life-giving Cross (September 14) is "May He who rose from the dead..."[580] added? Why in some Typika is it not clearly prescribed and why is "May He who rose from the dead" said, since the service is not resurrectional but pertaining to the Crucifixion?

541

During the afterfeast of the feasts of the Lord, the dismissals are done with the characteristic one for the feast of the Lord. Does the same thing also apply for the feast of the Exaltation? Namely, is "May He who rose from the dead..." added to the dismissals up until the leavetaking?

What needs to be clarified from the beginning is that it is useless to seek witnesses in the ancient Typika and Hieratika regarding what was the form of dismissal during the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and, generally, of all its variations in contemporary practice. The simple original dismissal form, "Let us go forth in peace,"[581] gradually was augmented with new dismissal elements and repeated blessings, especially in the monastic liturgical tradition, and was done from habit and memory. Consequently, only the modern liturgical books are by necessity the sources to which we can turn. The first determination is that the dismissal for the feast of the Exaltation is the resurrectional one ("May He who rose from the dead..."). It is so written in the currently used *Calendar-Typika*, Typika, and Hieratika. However, from pertinent research in the printed editions, I have the impression that in the most esteemed of them, while the other dismissals of the feasts of the Lord are listed,

580. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν..."
581. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

there does not exist a special dismissal for the feast of the Exaltation. This must not be considered accidental. In the same editions, sometimes on the next page, there exist eisodika and the special eisodikon of the Cross ("Exalt the Lord our God...")[582] is referenced in them. In addition, neither the Typikon of Saint Sabas nor the Typikon of Kōnstantinos make mention concerning a special dismissal, while at the same time they note the eisodikon of the Exaltation.[583] The lack of clarity partly exists in the currently used Typikon of Violakēs. It also lists this well-known eisodikon, but not also, "May He who rose from the dead" in the dismissal, contrary to what it does in the other feasts of the Lord, where it necessarily shows the pertinent initial phrase of the dismissal. However, in the introduction, in the special paragraph, "Concerning the dismissal in general," it records: "On the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the resurrectional dismissal is said on whichever day the feast falls, given that in the Matins we say, 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ'" (publication of Michaël Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. 14).[584] We will later comment on this standard rubric. However, one can point out other peculiar and inconsistent things. On the assumption that, as a feast of the Lord, the Exaltation has a special characteristic in the dismissal, according to the general rule that applies to all the parallel cases, this form of dismissal ought to be maintained throughout the entire period of the afterfeast and on the leavingtaking of the feast. However, this does not happen or at least it is not attested to anywhere.

Secondly, the form of the dismissal ought to align with the eisodikon, which either is repeated verbatim or nearly verbatim in all similar instances. Conversely here, while the eisodikon and eph-

582. "Ὑψοῦτε Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν..."

583. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 86; Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 21.

584. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

ymnion of the third antiphon are ones pertaining to the Crucifixion ("Save us...who was crucified for us..."),[585] the characteristic one of dismissal is resurrectional ("May He who arose from the dead..."). The potential theological rationale is unfounded that Cross and Resurrection accompany each other, and the feast has a "stauroanastasimo"[586] character. According to the same reasoning, the Procession and the Finding of the Precious Cross (August 1, March 6 respectively) ought to have resurrectional dismissals. Even more so the services of Great Friday, of which the feast of the Exaltation constitutes a festal replication. However, it clearly and unequivocally has its own well-attested to dismissals pertaining to the Crucifixion ("May He who endured spitting...,"[587] "May He who for us men..."[588]). The modern Typika of the Holy Mountain either do not make mention concerning a special dismissal, such as the Typikon of Saint Sabas, therefore they do not know a special dismissal, as also the Slavonic Typikon, or give a characteristic clarification, which precisely confirms the determination above: "We say at the dismissal, 'May He who rose from the dead, Christ...' when the Exaltation falls on Sunday, but on other days, 'May Christ our true God,'"[589] (Typikon of Methodios and the sacred monastery of Dionysiou). This appears to be the accurate practice.

How now was "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..."[590] of Matins associated with the resurrectional dismissal? Indeed, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." goes hand in hand with the dismissal, "May He who rose from the dead...," during the period of Pascha up until its leavetaking and on the weekly Pascha, the Sundays. When a feast of the Lord coincides on Sunday, both are not said. However, this is not necessary or absolute. It simply

585. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς ... ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς σταυρωθείς..."

586. "σταυροαναστάσιμο." A character that is resurrectional and pertains to the Crucifixion at the same time.

587. "Ὁ ἐμπτυσμούς..."

588. "Ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους..."

589. "Εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν λέγομεν 'Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστός,' ὅταν τύχῃ Κυριακῇ ἡ Ὕψωσις, εἰς δὲ ἄλλας ἡμέρας 'Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός,'" Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 42.

590. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."

means that the Matins is resurrectional when "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." is said or it is not when the theme of the feast of the Lord prevails. Similarly, by analogy, also the Divine Liturgy when it is concluded or is not concluded with "May He who rose from the dead...." However, there exist two instances which show that the connection of both these elements cannot constitute an argument for the resurrectional dismissal to also be extended to the Exaltation of the Precious Cross; the feast of the Ascension and the Meeting of Christ, if they coincide with Sunday. On both these feasts, while we have "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." in the Matins, they have another special dismissal ("May He who ascended in glory...,"[591] "May he who deigned to be carried in the arms..."[592]). A third instance is the Exaltation, where "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...," which is attested to by all the sources, was probably associated with the triple reference to the Cross of the Lord, despite the mention of the Resurrection, three times as well.[593]

542

Why during the feast of the Transfiguration of the Savior is the troparion, "Now what was unheard was heard...,"[594] chanted after "Especially for our most holy...,"[595] and at its leavetaking the heirmos, "Your childbirth was shown incorruptible..."[596]?

From the evidence we have, this question cannot find a satisfactory answer. It is not the first time that we encountered a similar complexity, without an apparent reason, also in the taxis for the feast of

591. "Ὁ ἐν δόξῃ ἀναληφθείς..."
592. "Ὁ ἐν ἀγκάλαις..."
593. Phountoulês is referring to the fact that in "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." (Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι...), there is a triple reference to both the Cross and the Resurrection. Although not being referenced here, the troparion chanted three times in place of the trisagion on the feast also mentions both the Cross and Resurrection, "Your cross we worship and your holy Resurrection we glorify" ("Τὸν Σταυρόν σου προσκυνοῦμεν, Δέσποτα, καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου Ἀνάστασιν δοξάζομεν").
594. "Νῦν τὰ ἀνήκουστα ἠκούσθη..."
595. "Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας..."
596. "Ὁ τόκος σου ἄφθορος ἐδείχθη..."

the Transfiguration, when we addressed the question concerning its eisodikon, between the old one, "Tabor and Hermon will rejoice in your name...,"[597] or the modern one, "For with you is the fountain of life, in your light we shall see light..."[598] (question 331). There, at the time, we navigated within a multitude of witnesses, given that the existence of two additional eisodika was noted, "O Lord, send out your light and your truth; these guided me and led me to your holy mountain,"[599] and the original common eisodikon, "O come, let us worship...."[600] Matters are somewhat simpler here because both the witnesses and instances are fewer. However, the previous retrospection also proves beneficial for the present inquiry because it showed that specifically the feast of the Transfiguration suffered many changes during modern times in relation to its liturgical taxis, as well as interferences not always successful or at any rate needless.

The first thing that surprises us in the case that the question refers to is a kind of inconsistency that we do not encounter in another feast. During the leavetaking of the feast, according to a general rule, the service of the main day is chanted and the megalynarion for the Mother of God that has been chanted on the day of the feast is also chanted in the Divine Liturgy. In our case, based on the principle above, "Now what was unheard was heard..." ought to also be chanted at the leavetaking. This is also noted in the question. However, there also exists an additional inconsistency. Likewise according to a general rule, during feasts of the Lord and Mother of God, the heirmos of the ninth ode of the feast is chanted at "Especially for our most holy...," even if this is brief and does not cover the reading of the diptychs, which is its purpose, such as in the Sunday of Thomas and in the feast of the Ascension ("In the radiant light...,"[601] "You who is above mind..."[602]). On the feast of the Transfiguration, we have two canons and two heirmoi in the ninth ode: "Your childbirth

597. "Θαβὼρ καὶ Ἑρμὼν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἀγαλλιάσονται" (88:13b).

598. "Ὅτι παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς, ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὀψόμεθα φῶς" (Psalm 35:10).

599. "Κύριε, ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου· αὐτά με ὡδήγησαν καὶ ἤγαγόν με εἰς ὄρος ἅγιόν σου."

600. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν καὶ προσπέσωμεν..." (Psalm 94:6a).

601. "Σὲ τὴν φαεινὴν λαμπάδα..."

602. "Σὲ τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν..."

was shown incorruptible..." of the first canon and "All hearing shuddered..."[603] of the second. The first is strangely not selected, but neither also the second one for an unknown reason. The preference is for the third troparion of the seventh ode of the second canon, "Now what was unheard was heard...." The Typika of Kônstantinos and Violakês provide for this,[604] while at the leavetaking (August 13) they retain the heirmos of the ninth ode of the first canon, "Your childbirth was shown incorruptible...."[605] The inconsistency became perceptible, and its correction was attempted in modern *Calendar-Typika*. "Now what was unheard was heard..." is prescribed also to be chanted at the leavetaking.

At "Especially...," the custom for a megalynarion of the Theotokos to be chanted, "It is truly meet..."[606] or "All creation rejoices in you, O full of grace...,"[607] or the heirmos of the ninth ode of the feast of the Lord or Mother of God, must not be older than the fourteenth century. For this reason, only in the modern Typika can we search for an answer to the question that reasonably arises regarding the feast of the Transfiguration. The suspicion that the original rubric would provide for the heirmos of the ninth ode, just as in all the other feasts, is verified by the Typikon itself of Violakês, which does not on the one hand introduce the change, but on the other must likely be close in time and place to that change. He prefers "Now what was unheard was heard...," but feels the need to justify the reason for his preference in a footnote: "This was already customary; but strictness requires the heirmos of the ninth ode, 'Your childbirth was shown incorruptible,' because this primarily is a theotokion, and an heirmos theotokios is said after 'Especially' in all feasts of the

603. "Ἔφριξε πᾶσα ἀκοή..."

604. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 197; Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 302.

605. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 198; Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 304–305.

606. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν..."

607. "Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει, κεχαριτωμένη..."

Lord" (publication of Michaël Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. 302).[608] Nevertheless, rather than "strictness," he prefers "custom," just as also occurred with the eisodikon. In terms of "strictness," he is right. The modern monastic Typika of the Holy Mountain confirm it, where both for the feast and the leavetaking, they prescribe the correct "Your childbirth...." However, a subsequent hand interferes in the Typikon of the monastery of Dionysiou. It erases "Your childbirth..." and corrects, "Now what was unheard was heard...," which was originally provided only for the elevation of the Panagia at the trapeza. This is probably an influence of the modern printed Typikon. The same second hand in the Typikon of the monastery of Dionysiou also extends the correction to the leavetaking of the feast, obviously for reasons of formal consistency.

543

What is the meaning of "Do good, master,"[609] which the deacon says to the priest after the great entrance?[610]

The deacon's reminder commands to the priest, primarily during the Divine Liturgy, present certain peculiarities that are due to the interim development of priestly practices and words, which are introduced in tandem with them. The diaconal exhortations essentially remained more conservative and more faithful to the more ancient practice, certainly since the concelebration of a deacon was something relatively rare or, in any case, not an everyday occurrence. The most characteristic example is the diaconal exhortation during the placement of the asteriskos during the proskomidē, "Establish, master."[611] The priest's old response was "By the Lord's word the heavens were established...,"[612] which precisely the deacon's word reminds, "Establish" (Στερέωσον) – "were established" (ἐστερεώθησαν). However, the later symbolisms, which saw in the asteriskos, the form

608. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 302.

609. "Ἀγάθυνον, δέσποτα."

610. See also question 400, 408, and 482.

611. "Στερέωσον, δέσποτα."

612. "Τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν..." (Psalm 32:6).

of the star of the Magi during the Lord's Nativity, became a cause for the priestly phrase accordingly to change ("And the star coming...").[613] We already encountered this change in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos and in Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki. However, earlier, and even later manuscripts and standard rubrics continue to remain faithful to the more ancient practice, to "By the Lord's word...." However, whether "By the Lord's word...were established" was provided to be said, or the later one, the deacon continued to say the ancient exhortation just as is also done up until nowadays.

Something analogous happens with the diaconal, "Do good, master," during the censing of the precious gifts after the great entrance. The priest's expected response is, "Do good to Sion, Lord, in your good pleasure...,"[614] namely, the end of the fiftieth psalm (verses 20–21), which the deacon initially recited, and later the priest, during the censing prior to the great entrance. The end of the psalm was not said, obviously because the deposit of the gifts on the holy table had been linked with the phrases of the last verses, "then you will delight in a sacrifice of righteousness, in offering and whole burnt offerings, then they will offer calves on your altar," and was judged more appropriate for them to be said at this point. And "Do good, master" is not attested to by the manuscripts, and it appears that it was introduced later. However, it is attested to by all the manuscripts that the verses began from "Do good to Sion, Lord...." Consequently rightly, and by analogy to the other diaconal reminder commands, "Do good, master" was introduced. This is what hereinafter also happened to "Establish, master." While the priestly practice developed, rather incorrectly, with the omission of verses 20 and 21a ("Do good to Sion, Lord...and whole burnt offerings"), the diaconal phrase remained in its more ancient form, just as it had prior to the omission.

Why was the last phrase, "then they will offer calves on your altar," preserved even after the prevailing omission of the previous verses from "Do good" onward? Perhaps because its recitation was

613. "Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ ἀστήρ..."

614. "Ἀγάθυνον, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου τὴν Σιών..." (Psalm 51:20).

more impressive. From indications of certain manuscripts, it appears that the recitation of these verses was done in the manner of a dialogue between priest and deacon, almost like the recitation of the Cherubic hymn prior to the great entrance. Just as there, the priest recites the Cherubic hymn three times up until "care"[615] and the deacon takes the end, "That we may receive...,"[616] so also here, the priest said from "Do good" up until "whole burnt offerings" and the deacon took over the ending, "Then they will offer calves," which indeed he repeated three times.[617] It is very likely that this contributed to this point of the Divine Liturgy developing somewhat strangely. However, as often happens, the diaconal, "Do good, master," remained as a reference point to recall the older and correct taxis and to assist in its restoration. Namely, that in the present case after "Do good, master," "Then they will offer..." is not said alone, but the entire end of the fiftieth psalm from "Do good to Sion, Lord..." onward.

---

615. In other words, the partial recitation of the hymn as, "Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim and who sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-creating Trinity, let us [now] lay aside every earthly care" (Οἱ τὰ Χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς εἰκονίζοντες, καὶ τῇ ζωοποιῷ Τριάδι τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον προσᾴδοντες, πᾶσαν [νῦν] βιοτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν).

616. "That we may receive the king of all, invisibly escorted by the angelic hosts. Alleluia" (Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι, ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς ἀοράτως δορυφορούμενον τάξεσιν. Ἀλληλούϊα).

617. There are other instances in which a dialogue occurs between priest and deacon or reader, where the latter concludes a phrase with a triple repeated ending, such as in the case of a prayer read by a reader customarily during the consumption of the chalice, "Παναγία Δέσποινα Θεοτόκε..." (O Lady Panagia Theotokos...), where the phrase, "Ὅτι εὐλογημένη καὶ δεδοξασμένη ὑπάρχεις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν" (For you are blessed and glorified to the ages. Amen), is read customarily three times in the following order: reader, priest, reader. In another example, in monasteries at the service of the Trapeza during the elevation of the Panagia, the phrase "Μέγα τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος" (Great is the name of the Holy Trinity), is split into two ("Μέγα τὸ ὄνομα/Great is the name" and "Τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος/Of the Holy Trinity) and is customarily said three times antiphonally. The one elevating the Panagia is generally the participant who says, "Great is the name," with another responding. See question 407 regarding participants in the ceremony. For a text of the ceremony, see *Τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία τῆς τραπέζης ὡς εἴθισται εἰς τὰς Ἱ. Μονὰς τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: ἐκδίδεται ὑπὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν ἁγιορειτῶν πατέρων, 1980).

544

Is it correct on Sundays for the antiphons in the Divine Liturgy to be chanted with the verses of the psalms from Pascha with the rationale that Sunday is resurrectional?

We exhaustively wrote regarding the antiphons of the Divine Liturgy in connection with two questions that referred to the subject of the typika and the antiphons (questions 413 and 414). At the time, we saw what the tradition is for the antiphons and typika, what was the development of this section of the Divine Liturgy, how and why we arrived at the final disorganization (this is not a case of exaggeration) of this beautiful and vital liturgical element, some insufficient solutions, which were well-intentionally proposed and promoted, and we underscored the need for its correct traditional restoration before it is too late.

And for us to immediately come to the question above. The position that Sunday is resurrectional, the weekly Pascha of the Church, is absolutely correct. Moreover, in the antiphons of Sunday, the ephymnion of Pascha, "who rose from the dead...,"[618] is always said as emphymnia of the second antiphon as well as an ephymnion of the entrance verse ("O come, let us worship...").[619] However, the antiphons of Pascha are not identical with the antiphons of Sundays, although they are also resurrectional, as also the apolytikia of Sundays although resurrectional (of the eight tones) are not identical with the Paschal ones ("Christ is risen...,"[620] or "When they who with Mary came anticipating the dawn..."[621]). The extension of the antiphons of Pascha to Sundays only would cause a new confusion, would lessen the uniqueness of the Paschal Liturgy, and in addition, as unattested to, would be inconsistent with the traditional taxis. The theological reason that we mentioned above does not justify a meddling of such a type, which undoubtedly is arbitrary and anti-traditional.

However, the proposal above has in its favor, as it is confirmed in the question, the fact that it realizes two basic elements of the

618. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν..."
619. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν..."
620. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη..."
621. "Προλαβοῦσαι τὸν ὄρθρον αἱ περὶ Μαριάμ..."

problem of the antiphons, upon which its correct solution depends. First, the fact that it is inconceivable for the ephymnia to be said without the verses of the psalms. Otherwise, they are not even ephymnia, nor also naturally are they antiphons. An "antiphon" clearly is the psalm together with its ephymnion according to verse, which is chanted antiphonally, with an emphasis chiefly on the psalm and secondarily on the ephymnion, which adorns the chanting of the psalm and does not consume it. Second, the fact that the search for verses of the antiphons must not turn towards the Hagiopolite tradition of the monastic Typikon of Saint Sabas, namely, towards the typika, but towards the Antiochian–Constantinopolitan tradition of the parish antiphons. This is a case of two clearly different things, venerable and excellently organized by themselves, whose mixture distorts both and creates liturgical monstrosities, inadequate and destructive for both age-old traditions. It is self-evident that both cannot be said in the same Liturgy, namely, both the antiphons and the typika at the same time mixed, but either the antiphons or the typika, or alternately sometimes the antiphons and other times the typika, according to the rubrics of the Typikon, which have absolute force in the monasteries, but are adapted to the parishes according to the particular circumstances and needs of parish practice. We spoke regarding these matters at length in the answer to questions 413 and 414 and we will not repeat ourselves. These are the two basic positive elements, which encourage us to believe that the problem of the antiphons/typika has been understood, at least by some, and its correct solution is being sought out. As long as it is not sought in the special antiphons of Pascha, but is sought where it naturally exists during the continuous and undisturbed tradition and practice of the Church from nearly one thousand three hundred years ago (from the beginnings of the eighth century when it is attested to for the first time indeed as pre-existing), all the way up to our generation, which in its effort to restore it, actually ended it.

As it is well known, the first attestation regarding the three antiphons of the Divine Liturgy is provided by Saint Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople (d. 733), in his commentary on the Divine Liturgy (*Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*). There are

three psalms: 91 ("It is good to acknowledge the Lord…"),[622] 92 ("The Lord reigned, he was robed in majesty…"),[623] and 94 ("O come, let us rejoice in the Lord…").[624] Apart from the commentary above of Saint Germanos, it is particularly interesting for the other commentaries of the Fathers remarking on the Divine Liturgy to be studied and especially that of Theodōros of Andida (*Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy*, chapters 11–14)[625] and of Nikolaos Kabasilas (*On the Divine Liturgy*, chapters 17–19), where they explain these psalms and include them in the Divine Liturgy as organic elements, whatever day it is celebrated, indeed especially Sunday, due to the festive and resurrectional character of these prophetic texts.

---

622. "Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ…"

623. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν εὐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσατο…"

624. "Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα τῷ Κυρίῳ…"

625. Theodōros of Andida (twelfth century) is little known except for the work, *Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ γινομένων συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων πονηθεῖσα ἐκ προτροπῆς καὶ ἀξιώσεως τοῦ Θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Φυτείας Βασιλείου* (*Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy, composed at the behest and request of His Eminence Basileios, bishop of Phyteia*) (PG 140:417–468). According to René Bornert, the *Προθεωρία* is the earlier writing of Nikolaos of Andida, which was revised and abridged by Theodōros, who may have been a later successor to the same episcopal see. Bornert dates the original work of Nikolaos between 1055–1063. J. Darrouzès disagrees with Bornert and dates the work before 1100, most likely between 1085–1095. For this discussion, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 181–206, and J. Darrouzès, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azyme," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 199–203. For a theological analysis of the work, see Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 89–99. Additional studies include Roland Betancourt, "A Byzantine Liturgical Commentary in Verse: Introduction and Translation," OCP 81 (2015): 433–472 and Barbara Crostini, "Interpreting the Interpreters: The Principles and Aims of the Protheoria," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 42 (1993): 51–59. The translation of the terms "Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης" as "Summary Commentary" is based on Betancourt's study, who has written overviews of Nikolaos and Theodōros of Andida for a forthcoming work, Michael Grünbart and Alexander Riehle, eds., *Lexikon byzantinischer Autoren* (Leipzig: Akademie Verlag). Cited 4 December 2019. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/1863449/Entries_for_Nikolaos_von_Andida_and_Theodoros_von_Andida_

It appears that these three psalms (91, 92, and 94) of the antiphons of the Divine Liturgy were originally chanted whole, just as can be gathered from other parallels and from allusions in the patristic commentaries above. For different reasons, which are not to be made mention of at present, it gradually became prevalent for verses to be cut from them and the chanting of the third psalm (of the ninety-fourth) to be interrupted at verse 6a, at the eisodikon, "O come, let us worship and bow down to Him [Christ]."[626] Finally, four verses alone were chanted from each psalm, so that "Glory to the Father...,"[627] which concludes each single antiphon, goes back to the choir that began its chanting, according to the taxis, namely, the "Glory" of the first and of the third antiphon to the first choir (the "Glory" at the third antiphon, during which the entrance took place, was said prior to the kontakion after the entrance) and the "Glory" of the second antiphon to the second choir. In the manuscripts, most commonly, the first verse of the psalm (as it is done both at the prokeimena and at the allēlouaria) is alone encountered, either because the whole psalm was chanted from the Psalter, or because the selection of verses was done from habit and depending on the time allowances of the synaxes. In later manuscripts and in the printed editions, these verses are fixed in advance, but neither the number nor the selection of verses is always the same. Indeed, often one of the four verses of each antiphon is omitted or merged with the preceding one. In closing this answer, in order to make what we write clearer and not have to return to the subject, we will attempt the restoration of the antiphons, putting in parenthesis the missing verses.

Initially for the feasts of the Lord, special antiphons with psalms that prophetically referred to the subject of the feast were developed. This is easily understood for us if we compare it to what was done in later practice with the use of the Oktōēchos. During the great feasts of the Lord, the resurrectional service, as is well known, "is absent" and the elements of the feast of the Lord are chanted unmixed. This was precisely done with the antiphons. In feasts of the Lord, the

626. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν καὶ προσπέσωμεν αὐτῷ [Χριστῷ]."
627. "Δόξα Πατρί..."

common resurrectional antiphons gave up their place to the special antiphons of the feast. We later did the same thing also for the feast of the Mother of God with the tendency, which fortunately did not flourish, for it to be also extended to the feasts of great saints. However, in the new antiphons of the Mother of God, "O come, let us worship..." was left as an eisodikon, namely, the entrance verse of the third antiphon (Psalm 94:6a), either because the correct manner of structure for the antiphons had been forgotten in the meantime (namely, that the entrance verse is a verse of the psalm of the third antiphon, during which the entrance is done), or because they wished in this manner for the resurrectional character of the Liturgy to be preserved, something analogous with the parallel use of the Oktôêchos during the feasts of the Mother of God when they coincide with Sunday.

Now as for the ephymnia. The first antiphon (Psalm 91), always had as an ephymnion, "Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...,"[628] just as also up until nowadays. The second (Psalm 92) had, in Constantinople up until the twelfth century, the triple "Alleluia," and later "Through the intercession of your saints, save us, O Lord...."[629] The third antiphon (Psalm 94) had "Save us, O Son of God..."[630] or "Only begotten Son...,"[631] or later, the troparion of the feast. The ephymnia also present other variations and changes, which were done for various known or unknown reasons. In any case, the psalms remained invariable, as a main and original element, despite the shiftings of the ephymnia in the meantime. This is also for us especially instructive in order to assist us in correctly distinguishing what is an invariable and what is a variable element in divine worship. But in the present case, the three psalms especially chosen by the ancient Fathers for the Divine Liturgy are an invariable element. As for their ephymnia and their chosen verses, after the changes and rearrangements noted above, they arrived at the following schema:

628. "Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου..."
629. "Πρεσβείαις τῶν ἁγίων σου σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε..."
630. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ..."
631. "Ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός..."

Πρῶτον ἀντίφωνον: Ψαλμὸς 91ος	First Antiphon: Psalm 91
1. Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι... Ὕψιστε (στίχος 2) Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου...	1. It is good to acknowledge... O Most High (verse 2) Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...
2. Τοῦ ἀναγγέλλειν τὸ πρωΐ... κατὰ νύκτα (στίχος 3) Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου...	2. In order to declare your mercy in the morning... at night (verse 3) Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...
[3. Ἐν δεκαχόρδῳ ψαλτηρίῳ μετ' ᾠδῆς ἐν κιθάρᾳ (στίχος 4) Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου...]	[3. On a ten-stringed harp, with an ode on a lyre (verse 4) Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...]
4. Ὅτι εὐθὺς Κύριος... ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ (στίχος 16) Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου...	4. That the Lord is upright... no injustice in Him (verse 16) Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...
5. Δόξα καὶ νῦν. Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου...	5. Glory both now. Through the intercessions of the Theotokos...

Δεύτερον ἀντίφωνον: Ψαλμὸς 92ος	Second Antiphon: Psalm 92
1. Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν... περιεζώσατο (στίχος 1α) Σῶσον ἡμᾶς...	1. The Lord reigned... He was robed (verse 1a) Save us...
2. Καὶ γὰρ ἐστερέωσε... οὐ σαλευθήσεται (στίχος 1β) Σῶσον ἡμᾶς...	2. Indeed, He made firm... not be shaken (verse 1b) Save us...
[3. Τὰ μαρτύριά σου ἐπιστώθησαν σφόδρα (στίχος 5α) Σῶσον ἡμᾶς...]	[3. Your testimonies were made very sure (verse 5a) Save us...]
4. Τῷ οἴκῳ σου πρέπει... ἡμερῶν (στίχος 5β) Σῶσον ἡμᾶς...	4. Sanctity befits your house... days (verse 5b) Save us...
5. Δόξα καὶ νῦν. Ὁ μονογενής...	5. Glory both now. Only begotten...

Τρίτον ἀντίφωνον: Ψαλμὸς 94ος	**Third Antiphon: Psalm 94**
1. Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα... Σωτῆρι ἡμῶν (στίχος 1) Τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον.	1. O come, let us rejoice... our Savior (verse 11) The apolytikion.
2 Προφθάσωμεν τὸ πρόσωπον... ἀλαλάξωμεν αὐτῷ (στίχος 2) Τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον.	2. Let us anticipate his face... let us make a joyful noise to Him (verse 2) The apolytikion...
[3. Ὅτι Θεὸς μέγας Κύριος καὶ βασιλεὺς μέγας καὶ βασιλεὺς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (στίχος 3) Τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον.]	[3. Because the Lord is a great God and a great king and a great king over all the earth (verse 3) The apolytikion.]
4. Ὅτι ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ... αὐτοῦ εἰσι (στίχος 4) Τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον.	4. Because in his hand... are his (verse 4) The apolytikion...
5. Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν... Χριστῷ (στίχος 6α). Σῶσον ἡμᾶς... Τὸ ἀπολυτίκιον	5. O come, let us worship... Christ (verse 6a). Save us... The apolytikion
[6. Δόξα καὶ νῦν]. Τὸ κοντάκιον.	[6. Glory both now]. The kontakion.

According to a somewhat older form, which is maintained in the monasteries and also exists in the Hōrologion, when it is not a feast, the old ephymnia, "Through the intercessions of your saints...," and, "Save us, O Son of God...," are preserved in the second and third antiphons respectively, but the psalms in all instances remain immovable.

We sufficiently wrote regarding the monastic tradition of the typika with the Beatitudes in the answers that we mentioned above. The Typikon stipulates when and how they are chanted as a replacement for the "asmatic" antiphons of the Divine Liturgy. In the

answers above, we saw the reasons for which this replacement was attempted and what its repercussions were on the practice of the parish temples. It is self-evident that if the typika and the Beatitudes are not chanted according to the Typikon of Saint Sabas, the antiphons will be chanted according to the old taxis of the Great Church, just as we analyzed above. The old taxis is ancient, venerable, and beautiful, at least as much as also the typika.

545

Seven more troparia for the service of marriage.

In the answer to question 409, which referred to hymnography connected with the mystery of marriage, we cited two series of troparia and an idiomelon, which were chosen from relatively late manuscripts (fourteenth–seventeenth centuries), written especially for the service of crowning.[632] Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain in the third oration of *Morality for Christians* urges Christians not to sing worldly songs on their weddings, but "spiritual ones," namely, troparia, heirmoi, and ecclesiastical hymns referring to Christ, the Theotokos, and the saints.[633] This oration has the distinctive title, "That Christians must not play instruments, dance, and sing at their weddings."[634] He especially advises "for someone to chant a spiritual song fitting to the mystery of marriage..., for example, such as are the present megalynaria and kathismata,

632. See also questions 25, 96, 98, 99, and 348.

633. Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν: Περιέχουσα Λόγους ψυχωφελεστάτους δεκατρεῖς, ῥυθμίζοντας ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τὰ κακὰ ἤθη τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πρὸς δέ, καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας Ἐντολὰς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης (Morality for Christians: Containing thirteen Orations profiting the soul, which educate to improve the bad morals of Christians. And in addition, also the authoritative Commandments of the Old and New Testaments)* (Venice: Ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Νικολάου Γλυκὺ τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1803), 24–36. Also compare the translation of this work, Hieromonk Patapios, trans. and ed., *Christian Morality: Containing Thirteen Soul-Benefiting Discourses, Contrived for the Improvement of the Poor Morals of Christians: and Additionally, the Most Basic Commandments of the Old and New Testaments by Saint Nicodemos the Hagiorite* (Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 2011).

634. "Ὅτι οἱ χριστιανοὶ δὲν πρέπει νὰ παίζουν ὄργανα καὶ νὰ χορεύουν καὶ νὰ τραγουδοῦν εἰς τοὺς γάμους των."

which we record here."[635] He next cites four megalynaria chanted to the melody of "More honorable"[636] and three kathismata, prosomoia of the automelon, "Soldiers watching over your tomb, O Savior...."[637] They obviously are compositions of Blessed Nikodēmos himself, in simple language and with simple meanings and to well-known melodies, as are the two automela that we noted above. Nikodēmos was probably not aware of the existence of special troparia for marriage like the ones encountered in the manuscripts which we mentioned at the time, where their use was limited anyway. He also did not intend them for the ecclesiastical service of marriage itself, but rather for the family phase and the wedding table, as at least it appears from references in the text. The troparia are strongly influenced by the prayers of marriage and we cite them here more for the completion of the picture that we have already drawn regarding the hymnography concerning marriage, rather than for convenient use. The service of marriage preserved its ancient simplicity and does not have a need of hymnological completion. Nevertheless, these troparia, as well as others that we cited in the aforementioned answer, could even nowadays be used for coverage of the traditional "kissing of the crowns"[638] instead of chanting irrelevant troparia ("In the Red Sea..."[639] and so forth) and where progressive secularization has not changed the kissing of the crowns into an exchange of congratulatory handshakes.

635. Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν*, 34.
636. "Τὴν τιμιωτέρα."
637. "Τὸν τάφον σου, Σωτήρ..."
638. "ἀσπασμός τῶν στεφάνων." On the kissing of the crowns and the newlyweds, see question 25.
639. "Ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ..."

1. Μεγαλυνάρια	1. Megalynaria[640]
Ἦχος πλ. δ'. Τὴν τιμιωτέραν	Tone plagal of the fourth. *More Honorable*
Εὐλόγησον, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός, * νεονύμφους τούτους, * ὡς εὐλόγησας Ἀβραάμ * καὶ τὴν Σάρραν πάλαι,* Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ρεβέκκαν * καὶ ἐκ παντοίας βλάβης * αὐτοὺς περίσωζε.	Bless, O Lord, God, * these newlyweds, * as you blessed Abraham * and Sarah long ago, * Isaac and Rebekah, * and from all harm * save them.
Φύλαττε τοὺς δούλους σου, Ἰησοῦ, * τοὺς συζύγους τούτους * ἐν ἀγάπῃ εἰλικρινεῖ, * ψυχῆς ὁμονοίᾳ * καὶ πνεύματος εἰρήνῃ * καὶ βασιλείας θείας * τούτους ἄξίωσον.	Preserve your servants, O Jesus, * these wedded ones * sincere in love, * concord of soul * and peace of spirit * and of the divine kingdom * deem them worthy.
Τίμιον τὸν γάμον τοῦτον, Χριστέ, * ἐν πᾶσι συντήρει * καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἁγνὴν * φύλαττε τὴν κοίτην * τῶν νῦν στεφανωθέντων * καὶ τέλους θεαρέστου * αὐτοὺς ἀξίωσον.	As honorable this marriage, O Christ, * in everything preserve * both undefiled and chaste * preserve the bed * of those who have now been crowned * and of an end pleasing to God * deem them worthy.
Χάρισαι, φιλάνθρωπε Ἰησοῦ, * νεονύμφοις τούτοις * εὐτυχίαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν * καὶ πολυτεκνίαν ὁμοῦ καὶ εὐτεκνίαν, * ἵνα σε μετὰ πόθου * ἀεὶ δοξάζωσιν.	Bestow, O Jesus who loves human kind, * upon these newlyweds * prosperity of good things * and abundance and blessing of children together, * that with longing * they may always glorify you.

2. Καθίσματα	2. Kathismata
Ἦχος α'. Τὸν τάφον σου, Σωτήρ	Tone one. *Soldiers watching over your tomb, O Savior*
Εὐλόγησον, Χριστέ, * τὸ ἀνδρόγυνον τοῦτο * ἐξ ὕψους οὐρανοῦ, * ὡς εὐλόγησας πάλαι * δικαίους οὓς ἠγάπησας * καὶ προπάτορας ἅπαντας, * Ἀβραὰμ ὁμοῦ * καὶ Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακὼβ τε, * Σάρραν ἅμα τε * καὶ τὴν Ρεβέκκαν καὶ Λείαν, * ὡς μόνος φιλάνθρωπος.	Bless, O Christ, * this married couple * from the height of heaven, * as you blessed long ago * righteous ones whom you loved * and all the forefathers, * Abraham together * also with Isaac and Jacob, * Sarah at the same time with * also Rebekah and Leia, * as the only one who loves humankind.
Δόξα. Ὅμοιον	Glory. Same

640. In order to promote comprehension of certain hymns, the word order has been changed in the translation.

Δοξάσωμεν Χριστόν, * ἀδελφοί, ὁμοφώνως, * τὸν πάλαι ἐν Κανᾷ * Γαλιλαίας παρόντα * καὶ γάμον εὐλογήσαντα * καὶ θαυμάτων ποιήσαντα * τὸ προοίμιον * καὶ παραδόξως τὸ ὕδωρ* οἶνον δείξαντα* καὶ κεκλημένους τοῦ γάμου* ἐν τούτῳ εὐφράναντα.	Let us glorify Christ, * brethren, with one voice, * the one long ago present * in Cana of Galilee * and who blessed marriage * and who made the beginning * of the miracles * and who wondrously showed * the water to be wine * and those who had been invited to the marriage * in this way gladdened.
Καὶ νῦν. Θεοτοκίον ὅμοιον	Both now. Theotokion same
Παρθένε Μαριάμ * ἡ ἀνύμφευτος νύμφη, * τὴν νύμφην τὴν καλήν * ταύτην φύλαττε, Κόρη, * ἐκ πάσης περιστάσεως * καὶ τὸν ταύτης ὁμόζυγον· * εὐτεκνίαν τε * χαριζομένη καὶ πᾶσαν * τὴν αὐτάρκειαν * τῶν ἀγαθῶν τοῦ Υἱοῦ σου * καὶ τέλος σωτήριον.	O Virgin Mary * the unwedded bride, * preserve, O Maiden * this good bride, * from every misfortune * and her husband; * who grants * both a blessing of children * and every self-sufficiency * of the good things of your Son * and a salvific end.

546

What is the meaning of the rubric of the Typikon, "The resurrectional elements take precedence"[641]? Does this principle always apply, even to the antiphons?

The standard rubric, "The resurrectional elements take precedence," has complete application to the service for Sundays, when of course they maintain their resurrectional character. And they always maintain it, except only if a feast of the Lord coincides on a Sunday. The elements of the feast of the Lord are then chanted "unmixed," namely, the theme of the Lord's Resurrection recedes (ὑποχωρεῖ) and the salvific event of His Nativity, His Theophany, His Transfiguration, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, and so forth, are celebrated. We write "it recedes,"[642] because it is not completely removed. The resurrectional prokeimenon of Vespers, "The Lord reigned...,"[643] is maintained, and according to strictness (according to the taxis of the monasteries) also the kissing of the Gospel book during the fiftieth psalm in the service of Matins, which is chanted in these instances

641. "Προηγοῦνται τὰ ἀναστάσιμα."
642. "ὑποχωρεῖ."
643. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν..."

just as also on Sundays. A simpler Typikon has become prevalent in parishes and, when Sunday coincides with a feast of the Lord, the fiftieth psalm is recited and the kissing of the Gospel book is not done, just as when the feast of the Lord coincides with a weekday.

However, during the afterfeast of feasts of the Lord and even on their leavetaking, when they coincide with Sunday, the resurrectional elements are chanted with the troparia of the feast. Then by necessity, "the resurrectional elements take precedence," even if it appears at first glance historically inconsistent. And this because, naturally, Christ was firstly born, baptized, transfigured, and so forth, and afterwards resurrected. But it is apparent from the taxis of the Church, that these rubrics were not developed on the basis of historical criteria but based on the theological teaching regarding the paramount event of our salvation, the Resurrection of Christ, which we celebrate on the day of Sunday. Based on this, the "prerogatives of Sunday"[644] so-called by the Kollybades, were formed, namely, the weekly Pascha, of the Sunday of the Resurrection. This does not dis-

644. "προνόμια τῆς Κυριακῆς." Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain discusses the "prerogatives of Sunday" in a chapter entitled, "Περὶ Προνομίων τῆς Κυριακῆς," in his work, *Ὁμολογία πίστεως: ἤτοι ἀπολογία δικαιότατη κατὰ τῶν, ὅσοι ἀμαθῶς καὶ κακοβούλως ἐτόλμησαν παρεξηγεῖν καὶ διαβάλλειν Παραδόσεις τινὰς τῆς Ἁγίας Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ τῶν περὶ Πίστεως ὑγιῆ καὶ ὀρθόδοξα φρονήματα τοῦ ἀοιδίμου Διδασκάλου Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἁγιορείτου* (Venice: Παρὰ Πάνῳ Θεοδοσίου τῷ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1819), 50–56. His discussion of such prerogatives takes place in the context of the position that memorial services must be celebrated on Saturdays and not Sundays, and a defense of those monks of Mount Athos who had advanced this view and were labeled Kollybades (Κολλυβάδες) after the use of boiled wheat known as kollyba (κόλλυβα) for such services. The theological controversy marking the last half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was complex and involved among other elements: a major theological dispute over the proper day to celebrate memorial services, a baptism controversy over the reception of Catholics and Protestants into Orthodoxy, struggles over the frequency of communion, questions of Church order, the advancement of spiritual and monastic renewal, the questioning of synodal and hierarchical decisions, and the validity of excommunications. An excellent overview of this complex period is provided by Socrates D. Petmezas, "On the formation of an ideological faction in the Greek Orthodox Church in the second half of the eighteenth century: the *Kollybades*" (paper presented at Συνέδριο, Θρησκεῖες καὶ Πολιτικὴ στὶς Ἀνατολὲς τῆς Εὐρώπης [14ος–20ος αἰῶνας], Thessaloniki, December 2011), https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287333830_Oi_Kollybades_e_synkrotese_enos_ideologikou_reu-

parage the other great feasts of the Lord and the salvific events that are celebrated on them, which when they coincide with Sunday its resurrectional theme moves aside. The same thing does not happen regarding the afterfeast, and very rightly.

If "the resurrectional elements have precedence" applies, for the reasons that we said, regarding the afterfeasts and leavetakings of feasts of the Lord, much more does it apply for feasts of the Mother of God and the feasts of the saints. During these, the resurrectional service is chanted together with the service of the feast and the resurrectional elements necessarily take precedence. Namely, the meaning of the standard rubric is that the Lord's Resurrection remains firstly as a theme of the Sunday and the themes of the feasts that coincide are introduced secondarily on it. Essentially, Sunday is found at the level of a feast of the Lord as Pascha and a commemoration of the Resurrection.

This rubric applies for all the Sundays of the year and for all instances in which troparia are chanted, during the stichéra and aposticha of Vespers and Matins, the kathismata and the canons, the exapostelaria, and the apolytikia. The resurrectional elements are first chanted and afterwards the remainder according to taxis, whether they are a forefeast or afterfeast or leavetaking of a feast of the Lord or Mother of God or feast of a saint. An exception is made only on the Wednesdays and Fridays of the Pentékostarion, which preserve in a broader sense the resurrectional character of the whole Paschal period, but without ceasing to be crucifixion days, during which the fast is not broken. This is also indicated by the position of the resurrectional elements on these days. While the resurrectional elements are chanted, those pertaining to the Crucifixion take precedence. The pertinent rubric exists in the printed Pentékostarion in the Vespers under Tuesday of the Second Week (Vespers for Wednesday),[645] where it is recorded in a footnote: "Note that on Wednesdays and Fridays for the aposticha, kathismata, and

matos_eutos_tes_Ellenorthodoxes_Ekklesias_sto_18o_aiona (accessed: May 30, 2022).

645. In other words, the Vespers, found listed in the book of Pentékostarion under Tuesday, is the Vespers intended for the next day.

lauds [of course also at Vespers] the crucifixion stichēra precede the resurrectional ones, because our Lord was first crucified, then so arose from the dead."[646] The manner of formulation and reasoning betray a modern recording. However, the practice is old and obviously unanimous. For example, the Typikon of the monastery of the Evergetis of Constantinople, which survives in a manuscript of the twelfth century (*Athens 788*) on folio 158 notes: "One must know that on Wednesday and Friday [of the period of the Pentēkostarion], the ones pertaining to the Crucifixion (τὰ σταυρώσιμα) are chanted first, then the resurrectional ones, next the martyrika."[647] Stereotypically repeated on these days is, "staurōsimon, resurrectional, martyrikon" (σταυρώσιμον, ἀναστάσιμον, μαρτυρικόν). The Typikon of the monastery of the Savior of Messina is more detailed (*Codex Messina 115*, from the year 1131): "One must know that the resurrectional stichēra take precedence over the penitential, apostolika, and martyrika stichēra up until the Ascension. Not over those pertaining to the Crucifixion (τῶν σταυρωσίμων), for on Wednesday and Friday the one pertaining to the Crucifixion (τὸ σταυρώσιμον) is chanted first and the resurrectional one after" (folio 230v).[648]

The antiphons are not subject to this rule. When the antiphons of an anticipated feast of the Lord or the Mother of God are chanted on Sunday, it is very natural for their ephymnia to be normally chanted just as on the main day of the feast, namely, the special verses of the psalm for each antiphon and "Through the intercessions...,"[649] "Save us... [of the feast],"[650] and the apolytikion of the feast respectively. The resurrectional apolytikion precedes in

646. Phountoulēs only partially quotes the text by leaving out "τὰ ἀπόστιχα, καθίσματα, καί" (the aposticha, kathismata, and). For clarity, these words are included in the quote above. The word for "Wednesdays" was also misspelled as "Τετάρσι" instead of "Τετράσι."

647. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 552–553.

648. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 258.

649. "Ταῖς πρεσβείαις..."

650. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς..."

the series of apolytikia that are chanted after the entrance. Namely, even here, the rule "the resurrectional elements take precedence" is applied where it belongs.

547

Is the bending of knees permitted during the consecration of the precious gifts when the Divine Liturgy is celebrated on Sunday or during the period of Pentecost?

548

Is kneeling obligatory during the consecration of the precious gifts for reasons of piety?

The subject of kneeling during the consecration of the precious gifts has been raised by many in various older and newer queries that have been indeed submitted in assorted variations, which are summarized in the two questions above. Namely, whether especially during Sundays and during the resurrectional period of the Pentēkostarion after Pascha, the pertinent prohibition of kneeling applies, which is stated by the sacred canons, or is it permitted by exception during the consecration of the precious gifts? For the other days of the year, it is probably considered obligatory, just as it is formulated in the second question. This topic had arisen almost fifty years ago, and much was written by different authors, acknowledged by name or even anonymously. The most opposing viewpoints were formulated and supported with sufficient acrimony, as is customary in our country, by the important theological personalities of that time, such as our teacher professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas of blessed memory, Chrēstos Enisleidēs,[651] the archimandrite Sōphronios Papakyriakou,[652] the priest Iōannēs Adamopoulos,[653] and others. From time to time up until nowadays, this subject is stirred up, and similar things to what

651. Chrēstos Enisleidēs (Χρῆστος Ἐνισλείδης), (1895–1985), a teacher at the gymnasion of Grevena, and afterwards at Pierce College in Athens.

652. Sōphronios Papakyriakou (Σωφρόνιος Παπακυριακοῦ), archimandrite and sacred preacher of the Metropolis of Aitolia-Acarnia.

653. Iōannēs Adamopoulos (Ἰωάννης Ἀδαμόπουλος), a parish priest of the Sacred Temple of Saint Kōnstantinos in Omonoia (Athens).

was written then are written, but in practice confusion or at least a dual practice is probably prevalent. During the same synaxis, some kneel during the consecration and others do not. The same thing also for priests, and worse, some kneel prior and after the consecration, others only prior or only after. It is not rare in a concelebration to see two or three of the above variants existing in parallel. Up until nowadays, despite the repeated questions (as we wrote), we avoided dealing with the contested issue, mainly in order not to provide an occasion for disputes, which are not constructive but become an occasion for the cooling of love, which is, according to the Apostle, "the bond of perfect unity" (Colossians 3:14), the binding tie for the members of the holy Church. With the hope that this will not happen, we will attempt to raise the issue as objectively as possible according to the saying, "without fear and without passion."[654]

I think that it would greatly assist our position on this subject if we made a brief retrospection into the relevant recent history of this issue while people still survive who knew the practice of our ecclesiastical life before this problem arose. I think it is well known that in our churches Christians did not kneel except only during the kneeling of Pentecost during the reading of the prayers of Vespers. And this term "Vespers of Kneeling"[655] or the popular term for the denoting of the Sunday of Pentecost, "Sunday of Kneeling,"[656] reveal the exceptional nature of the practice. They made prostrations during Great Lent and bowed down during the entrance of the Presanctified Elements, and according to immemorial practice, some of the pious, especially women and children, would kneel under the Gospel book during its reading or during the great entrance. This is an old custom (also attested to by the commentator Fathers of the Divine Liturgy), which some condemned because they considered it as a misunderstanding from the entrance of the Presanctified Elements, and others tolerated as the simpler faithful's expression of piety. Mention could not take place regarding kneeling during the consecration of the precious gifts because such a custom did not

654. "χωρὶς φόβο καὶ χωρὶς πάθος."
655. "Ἑσπερινὸς τῆς γονυκλίσας."
656. "Κυριακὴ τῆς Γονατιστῆς."

exist. The faithful, as well as the priests, "bowed"[657] deeply. However, they did not kneel. The same thing is also done up until nowadays on the Holy Mountain, where the ancient liturgical traditions are maintained with faithfulness and strictness. Neither do the celebrants bend the knee during the consecration, although according to the standard rubric "they are praying while bowing"[658] deeply, nor the monks, who also themselves after descending from their stasidia and uncovering themselves[659] deeply bow without kneeling. And the monks certainly know the taxis and the tradition, and no doubt are more pious than us all.

We said that the priests and the people did not kneel during the consecration in the parishes. We do not wish to idealize past situations, but we ought to be objective. They continued the old tradition of an upright posture, even if not all of them had knowledge of the sacredness of the moment or if they departed (especially men) after the reading of the gospel or would not cease (especially women) to chat.[660] Indeed, I have heard old simpleminded faithful, who at the time cohabited with Muslims and Roman Catholics and knew their worship customs, contrast the slavish kneeling of former to the vigorous posture of the Christians and to make a pun with the terms "Orthodox" (Ὀρθόδοξος) and "Catholic" (Καθολικός): An Orthodox is one who prays "upright" (ὀρθός) and a "catholic" (καθολικός) is one who prays "seated" (καθιστός). Both these things are insignificant and no doubt naïve but show that they perceived

657. "κλίνονταν."

658. "κλίνομενοι ἐπεύχονται."

659. The monks take off their hats (σκοῦφος) and cowls/hoods (ἐπανωκαλύμμαυχον or κουκούλιον, headdress worn as a sign of a tonsured monk). Here, the term "stasidia" is the plural of the term stasidion, (στασίδιον, τό; pl., στασίδια, τά) and refers to a seat in a monastic chapel or church. In question 557, Phountoulês states regarding their construction in modern monasteries, "For the synaxes, the worshipers invented stasidia, which, when properly constructed, such as for example on the Holy Mountain, are a marvel of knowledge of the human body's anatomy. They enable propping up the one praying when he stands upright, supporting him in a half-seated posture, and relaxing him when he is seated." Such seats are also designed to allow the worshipper when seated to rest his or her head on the arm rest.

660. Phountoulês is making cultural observations regarding the level of religious practice in Greek society at large.

the posture of prayer as an expression of faith and dogma and that the upright posture for them was the traditional posture for worship in the Orthodox Church. The simple people who made these comparisons were not alone. At the time an elder hierarch, of blessed memory for many years, most pious and traditional, intervened with an air of austerity when rebuking those who kneeled because in this manner, they converted the Orthodox Church into a "mosque"[661] or "a Frankish church."[662] Holy simplicity.

When, chiefly during the first decades of our century, an attempt for a more systematic catechesis of our people began with preaching, catechetical schools, books, and religious publications, apart from other particularly praiseworthy areas related to worship (more frequent churchgoing, attendance at holy confession and holy communion, staying in the temple throughout the whole length of the service, reduction of movements and chatting, and similar things), the importance of the consecration of the precious gifts was also emphasized, of the descent of the Holy Spirit during the invocation and the change of the bread and the wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. As a method for elevating this point of the Divine Liturgy, kneeling was intuitive and easily comprehensible by the people. The catechized Christians, who came chiefly from the large cities, knelt during, "Your own of your own offering to you in all and for all."[663] And the simpleminded faithful of the villages, when they asked the reason, often received the answer that "the heavens are opening" or that "the Holy Spirit is descending." Both theologian sacred preachers and clergy knelt and, shortly thereafter, so did the new priests of the villages in imitation of the others or because they had been so taught in ecclesiastical schools.

661. "τζαμί."

662. "φραγκοκκλησιά." This word is inspired from the word, "φραγκοκρατία," which refers to the rule of Byzantine lands by the "Franks," a term used collectively to denote Western Crusaders and other "Latins" (and at times, Roman Catholic clergy) during the Middle Ages. Similar terms continue in use, such as "φραγκόσυκο," literally a fig of the Franks, used to describe a prickly pear. Even popular Greek secular songs use the term "φράγκος" to distinguish Roman Catholics from Orthodox Christians.

663. "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα." See question 200, regarding the use of "προσφέροντες."

This posture of kneeling during the consecration was not a pious contrivance that was born in our country,[664] nor is it owed to a direct influence of the Roman Catholic Church's practice. For many years, it had already been introduced into the Russian church, not only during the consecration, but also at other key points of the Divine Liturgy. It appears that the influence of court practice played a decisive role in this, which was influenced in the new Hellenic state by the most pious Russian queen Olga.[665] The fact that this is not a simple momentary case, can be verified from a distinctive footnote that the professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas adds to the end of his book, *Kneeling on Sundays*, in Athens 1948, pages 30–31, where the pertinent practice of the court chapel is traced back to that queen and through her to the Russian tradition and is highlighted for justification of kneeling and for imitation.[666]

From there we can find the thread for following the progression of the influences. During the era of Peter the Great, thanks to the efforts of this meddlesome ruler to Europeanize the Russian tradition,

---

664. Greece.

665. Olga Constantinova (1851–1926), a member of the Romanov dynasty, was Queen Consort of Greece (1867–1913) when married to King Geōrgios I of Greece (1845–1913).

666. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Ἡ γονυκλισία ἐν ταῖς Κυριακαῖς* (Ἀθῆναι: Τύποις Φοίνικος, 1948), 30–31, n. 1:

> It is noteworthy that also in fellow Orthodox Russia the liturgical practice has established the worshipful adoration of the mystery also on these Sundays during the time of the consecration of the gifts by deep kneeling. A Sacred Preacher of the Archdiocese of Athens while traveling during recent years met with a Greek priest from Russia, who immediately after the consecration of the gifts fell down into a prone position, having the face on the ground, for adoration of the mystery. It was the day of the Lord. When such a practice in fellow Orthodox Russia was also introduced into the old chapel of the court by Queen Olga of blessed memory, her grandson His Majesty King Paul continuously also on the days of the Lord provides the example in the Liturgy and the sign for adoration of the Precious Gifts by kneeling not only during the time of the consecration, but also when the Elements are displayed from the sacred bēma to the faithful for communion.

Roman Catholic elements, such as polyphony, the Europeanizing style in icons, but also most likely kneeling, peripherally penetrated into Russian Orthodox worship.[667] However, neither did kneeling exist in the Western Church's primordial tradition. We have evidence that it was imposed by Popes Honorius III and Gregory X during the thirteenth century,[668] in a period of a general lack of learning, as a practical clear and understandable way to elevate the moment of transubstantiation, of communion, even of the phrase, "who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became man," of the Symbol of Faith.

The points above are not written out of bigotry and are not dictated out of phyletistic or religious fanaticism. I simply believe that it is the true history of this practice. There exist innumerable reciprocal influences on divine worship. The request is not for them not to exist, but for them not to change correct taxis. After this historical retrospection, we will come to the direct answer to the two questions above.

1. Regarding the first part of the dual question, the answer is (as I believe) clear and the possibilities for objections rather impossible. Perhaps one could also wonder how it is understandable for an opposing position to exist on the topic, regarding which so many authentic and unanimous conciliar and patristic statements exist. We will not attempt to compile a patristic anthology for the reason that it would be too long. The existence alone of two canons of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea (325) and of the Penthektē in Trullo (691) would be sufficient to put an end to any objection. We are presenting these alone:

667. Peter the Great, Tsar (1682–1725). Phountoulēs is referring to changes in the Church of Russia such as the use of polyphony in choral music. On the Church of Greece's rejection of four-part harmony and other influences in ecclesiastical music, see Ἀχιλλέας Γ. Χαλδαιάκης, *Ὁ Ν.Δ. Λεβίδης καὶ Τὸ Ἀνακύψαν Μουσικὸ Ζήτημα κατὰ τὸν Μαΐο τοῦ 1902* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1994).

668. Popes Honorius III (r. 1216–1227), Gregory X (r. 1271–1276). In the translation, the incorrect identification of them as in the tenth century is corrected to the thirteenth century.

a. The twentieth canon of Nicea: "Since there are some who bend the knee on Sunday and on the days of Pentecost, in order to preserve everything in every parish it seemed good to the holy council for prayers to be rendered to God while standing."[669]

b. The ninetieth canon of the Council in Trullo: "We canonically received from our God-bearing Fathers not to bend the knee on Sundays, while honoring the Resurrection of Christ; in order that we do not then misunderstand the clarity of this observance, let us appoint for it to be made clear for the faithful that after the entrance of the clergy into the altar during Vespers on Saturday, according to the prevailing custom, that no one bend the knee up until the following Vespers during Sunday, during which after the entrance at the Lamp-lighting again bending the knees we so offer prayers to the Lord. For accepting the night after Saturday as a precursor of the Resurrection of our Savior, henceforth we spiritually begin hymns, concluding the feast from darkness into light, so that henceforth in the entire night and day, we celebrate the Resurrection."[670]

Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain in his *Rudder* provides a wonderful and most precise commentary on both these canons, especially on the first, both in the "Concord" and in the extensive footnote, so that perhaps any further comment would be superfluous.[671] It is worth reading these things with attention because they contain references to the whole relevant canonical and patristic literature. But beyond what Blessed Nikodēmos writes, some points of these canons should be highlighted for the resolution of any doubt.

a. It is obvious that the canon of the First Ecumenical Council knows the existence of a variant practice in some places. However, it intervenes in a regulatory manner intending for the prevalence of

669. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:162.

670. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:516; George Nedungatt and Michael Featherston, eds., *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, Kanonika 6 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995), 170–171.

671. Ἀγάπιος Ιερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 150–152 298–299.

the common practice among the various "parishes," on a point that it judged required and correct based on the Church's precise tradition and theological teaching, but without justifying it. However, the position is completely clear and categorical. The holy Council is in favor of the upright posture during the prayer of the day of Sunday and the Pentecost period. The legislation is not loose, but on the contrary concise and very clear. The fact that it does not threaten ecclesiastical sanctions, indeed in an epoch of a reconstruction of ecclesiastical affairs immediately after the period of great persecutions, is not something that also signifies tolerance or acquiescence towards another practice, namely, of the bending of the knees on Sunday and the days of Pentecost. Moreover, other canons of the same Council are also formulated in almost the same manner. And the fact alone that the First Ecumenical Council occupied itself with this topic and formulated the canon above is indicative that it did not consider it a trifle.

The fact that there existed exceptions, namely, faithful who bent the knees during the synaxes of Sundays and of the period of Pentecost, is not only implied by the canon, but also known to us from the *Apostolic Constitutions* and from other evidence. Moreover, this would also be self-evident. This is what precisely caused the intervention of the Council, and it is upon this matter the Council provides guidance.

b. The ninetieth canon of the Penthektē also knows and implies the canon of the First, when it states that "we canonically received from our God-bearing Fathers." It supplements this canon, theologically justifying the preference for the upright posture during Sunday—it does not refer to the period of Pentecost—and setting time boundaries for not bending the knees by the entrance of Sunday Vespers. Obviously, there was some dispute as to these boundaries, because this undoubtedly is the aim of the canon. Indeed, it refers (just as also the relevant patristic witnesses) to a practice that later fell into disuse or even disappeared in our Church, to the frequency of the kneeling prayer both privately and in the Church's synaxes. The upright posture to denote and celebrate Sunday, as well as our own resurrection, was therefore clearer and required during the res-

urrectional days. However, this did not mean that we have the right to reverse matters and the tradition. Namely, instead of us emphasizing the theological meaning of two traditional postures for prayer (that of kneeling as an expression of humility and repentance, and that of being upright as an expression of joy, of the resurrection and the freedom and boldness in Christ of the children of God), we are cultivating and encouraging the bending of knees for reasons of piety on resurrectional days, on which the canons and the Fathers clearly prescribe uprightness as a posture of prayer.

The return to the issue of kneeling by the Penthektē Ecumenical Council and the new canon's formulation certainly means that there existed exceptions or violations of the old canon. But this does not grant us in the name of the exceptions to ignore already two canons of Ecumenical Councils, which regulate this issue, as well as the pertinent unanimous teaching of the Fathers. It is inconceivable in the Orthodox Church, which is the traditional Church par excellence and boasts regarding its dedication to age-old apostolic and patristic institutions, to do, and worse to teach, something for which there exists [no] expressed conciliar and patristic teaching.[672] Christ's Resurrection and an upright posture for prayer are synonymous, and it is our obligation to assist the people to grasp the meaning of this marvelous symbolism, not by brandishing the prohibition of the canons, but by examining the spirit that is expressed with forms of worship, just as it is formulated by the Fathers, canons, and the ancient customs of the Church. I do not know another existing liturgical symbolism that has a similar substantiation. In the Orthodox representation of the Lord's Resurrection, Adam and Eve alone are depicted kneeling, but the mighty hand of the resurrected Christ lifts them upright in order that they partake in the joy of the resurrection of the dead.

However, at this point, the objection is interjected that the bending of the knees during the consecration of the precious gifts on Sunday and the period of Pentecost is not done to profess repentance or mourning, but on account of piety towards the supreme mystery, which is being celebrated at this moment, and of honor

672. The negative is missing from the last clause of this sentence and has been added for clarity.

towards the Holy Spirit, who is sent down and comes "upon us and upon these gifts presented."[673] The fact that this is done not as a entreaty, but "on account of kissing,"[674] will be examined next together with the second part of the question.

2. The posture of the faithful in divine worship is determined by a specific traditional deontology, which is expressed with postures and movements commensurate with the importance of the individual times of prayer. Namely, while in our private prayer we freely or largely in an unplanned manner pray or take postures of prayer according to our preferences and according to our intention or capabilities; expression, words, and postures in our common worship are subject to rules that ensure coordination in the worship synaxes. Otherwise, prayer jointly is inconceivable. This deontology is prescribed by the specific commands of the deacon, who in the synaxis performs the work of a master of ceremonies in relation to the priest and in relation to the people ("Arise,"[675] "Let us bow our heads...,"[676] "Bending the knees...,"[677] "...raise us up...,"[678] "...let us go forth...,"[679] "...draw near,"[680] and so forth). As for personal piety and individual preferences, these are subordinate to the common Typikon and become coordinated with the posture and manner of the community's prayer. Our piety consists in this, in our obedience to the Church's will, and not in our own arbitrary intention. Otherwise, our supposed piety is an impious and egoistic practice. The task of teachers is to assist the faithful to be properly integrated into the worshipping Church and not to become autonomous, after of course, the same ones first attempt and achieve it for themselves.

673. "ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα." This is a quotation from the anaphora of the Divine Liturgies of Iōannēs Chrysostomos and Basileios the Great.

674. "χάριν ἀσπασμοῦ."

675. "Ὀρθοί."

676. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν... κλίνωμεν."

677. "Κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα..."

678. "... ἀνάστησον..."

679. "...προέλθωμεν..."

680. "...προσέλθετε."

What now is the posture of the faithful during the consecration of the precious gifts? According to the points above, it is what the deacon specifies with his commands. In our Byzantine tradition, these are "Let us stand aright, let us stand with fear...,"[681] namely, the pious upright posture. In the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, the command is formulated in more detail: "Let us stand aright, let us stand piously, let us stand with fear of God and compunction...."[682] In the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Markos, the deacon interjects giving the command to those seated to stand upright: "Those seated arise."[683] This is precisely the posture that we see for celebrant hierarchs (Saint Basileios the Great, the sacred Chrysostomos, Saint Nikolaos, Saint Athanasios the Great, and so forth) depicted in the apse of the sacred bēma, as well as in portable icons, frescos, or miniatures of manuscripts. Moreover, the resurrectional and Paschal character itself of the Divine Liturgy dictates this posture, the upright posture that represents the Resurrection and freedom from slavery. The Divine Liturgy on whatever day of the week it is celebrated is the Pascha of the Church, its commemoration of the Resurrection from the dead of the Conqueror of death and Hades, who became dead and lived and now is the one who lives to the ages of ages (Revelation 2:8). This is why it is not celebrated, its celebration "has no place,"[684] during Great Lent's mourning days of penitence. It is something irreconcilable.

The argument is certainly put forward that kneeling during the consecration does not have a character of entreaty and mourning, but one of piety towards the mystery, namely, that it is done "on account of kissing."[685] This erudite statement is derived from a ques-

681. "Στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου..."

682. "Στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν εὐλαβῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ κατανύξεως...," B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 82.

683. "Οἱ καθήμενοι ἀνάστητε." Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 50; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 35.

684. "χωρεῖ."

685. "χάριν ἀσπασμοῦ."

tionable canon that is attributed to Saint Nikēphoros the Confessor (d. 829). The rather troubled text from the point of view of the manuscript tradition permits or rather requires ("χρή" – "it is necessary, one must") the bending of the knees on Sunday and all Pentecost, but not also for the customary kneeling to be done during these days. This canon cannot be understood without reference to the two conciliar canons (which we mentioned) but even the whole relevant tradition of the Church. Even if this canon is genuine, it is incomprehensible for a Father/author of this canon to object to the canons of the 318 Fathers of the First Ecumenical Council and the 227 or 240 Fathers of the Penthektē. This does not constitute, in some manner, a dismissal of the question, but of the correct incorporation of this canon into the tradition of the Church. Saint Nikodēmos precisely so interprets it, namely, that it does not refer to a kneeling prayer, which in any case is forbidden by the sacred canons on resurrectional days, but to prostrations, which while permitted when they are done "on account of kissing," namely, of greeting holy icons, respected persons, and so forth, are forbidden when they are done as a mark of repentance and mourning, such as those where they are done during Great Lent and during the resurrectional days.[686]

Can the bending of the knees during the consecration be covered by this canon, namely, be considered that it is done "on account of kissing"? Clearly not. The kneeling is being linked with the words of the prayer of the anaphora, where certainly with a triple repetition of a synonymous word in the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos ("we call upon you and pray and supplicate,"[687] or in the Divine Lit-

686. This is the tenth canon attributed to Saint Nikēphoros the Confessor, which reads, "Χρὴ χάριν ἀσπασμοῦ κλίνειν γόνυ ἐν Κυριακῇ, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Πεντηκοστῇ, οὐ μὴν τὰς ἐξ ἔθους γονυκλισίας ποιεῖν," (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:428). Its translation into vernacular Greek by Saint Nikodemos of the Holy Mountains reads, "Πρέπει νὰ κλίνῃ τινὰς γόνυ χάριν ἀσπασμοῦ ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Πεντηκοστῇ, ὄχι ὅμως καὶ νὰ κάμνῃ τὰς συνήθεις γονυκλισίας," (Ἀγάπιος Ιερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* [Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982], 727).

687. "καὶ παρακαλοῦμέν σε καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκετεύομεν" (Divine Liturgy of Iōannēs Chrysostomos).

urgy of Basileios the Great, "we pray and call upon you"[688]) they express an intense supplication. But if we insist on us characterizing our kneeling during this time as a source and required expression of piety toward the truly supreme point itself of the ceremony of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, then what posture ought we to devise for us to express our respect and piety during the equally supreme point of our approach to the mystery, the hour of holy communion. Nevertheless, we commune of the Body and Blood of the Lord upright, while giving glory to the risen Christ, the reason for our own resurrection.

549

For the entrance to take place, where is it more correct for the chanting of the Cherubic hymn to be interrupted? At "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king) or at "ὑποδεξόμενοι" (we may receive)?[689]

550

When "ὑποδεξόμενοι" (may receive)[690] is said after the great entrance, is it right for it to be corrected to "ὑποδεξάμενοι" (having received)[691] since the reception of the precious gifts has already taken place?

As to the first question, the tradition is not unanimous. At least nowadays, some make the break at "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king)

---

688. "σοὶ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν" (Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great)

689. The translation of excerpts given in the text of the question is literal and does not correspond to their translation in the context of the hymn. In the Cherubic hymn, the excerpted words appear as follows (underlined), "Οἱ τὰ Χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς εἰκονίζοντες, καὶ τῇ ζωοποιῷ Τριάδι τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον προσᾴδοντες, πᾶσαν νῦν βιοτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν. Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι, ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς ἀοράτως δορυφορούμενον τάξεσιν. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα." A translation of the hymn is (with the words being referenced underlined), "Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim and who sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-creating Trinity, let us now lay aside every earthly care. That we may receive the king of all, invisibly escorted by the angelic hosts. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia."

690. This is the plural future middle masculine nominative participle of the verb, "ὑποδέχομαι."

691. This is the plural aorist middle masculine nominative participle of the verb, "ὑποδέχομαι."

in order for the great entrance to be done and continue "τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι" (we may receive...of all) after the entrance, others interrupt at "ὑποδεξόμενοι" (we may receive) and continue from "ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς" (by the angelic), and others stop at "μέριμναν" (care) in order for them to begin from "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king) after the entrance. The old-time chanters practice the first one and it appears to be the relatively more ancient custom. The second probably is later and, as far as anyone can know, the most prevalent nowadays. The third is rarely heard. Something definite cannot be deduced from the old music books, and besides they have not been sufficiently studied. After "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king), they customarily have a kratēma,[692] during or after which the entrance must have been done. The kratēma provided the possibility for the chanter to cover any delay of the exit of the celebrants for the entrance, or to interrupt the chanting where needed. Let it be noted that according to the old practice, the proskomidē was done during the cheroubikon. Consequently, the length of the chanting of its first part ought to be correspondingly long. And nowadays some hierarchs observe the ancient taxis and, especially for a hierarchical concelebration, the chanting of the cheroubikon needs to be slow or with the kratēma at "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king") in order to cover the required time for the completion of the proskomidē.

The third practice, when the break is done at "μέριμναν" (care), has some evidence in its favor that makes it worthy of attention. During the triple recitation of the cheroubikon in a dialogue by the celebrants, the deacon continues from "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king). The second choir also interjects the same thing from this point, even if the entrance is done later. These things mean that some ancient break existed between "μέριμναν" (care) and "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king), during which perhaps the entrance was done.

In any case, the development of the cheroubikon is so complex that it does not assist us in reaching firm conclusions. Originally,

692. "κράτημα." Also known as "Τεριρέμ," an intentional elongation of a melody using syllables that do not form words in order to avoid the repetition of words and to cover periods of time during liturgical celebration as needed.

the entrance of the gifts was done very simply and without anything being chanted in conjunction with the offering of the gifts by the faithful. We so encountered it in the ancient and undeveloped Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. During the middle of the sixth century, significant changes took place at this point of the Divine Liturgy in Constantinople. During the reign of Justin II (565–578), according to the testimony of Kedrēnos (*Synopsis Historiōn*), and specifically during the year 574, "the Cherubic hymn was also decreed to be chanted."[693] However, "a psalmic hymn,"[694] obviously the twenty-third psalm, had already been introduced in order for the time of the preparation and transfer of the gifts to the altar to be covered. This is gathered from the witness of Saint Eutychios, patriarch of Constantinople (552–565 and 577–582), who strongly objected to this novelty, probably without effect. The objection of Eutychios chiefly related to the fact that in the psalm the not yet sanctified gifts were characterized as "King of Glory"[695]: "When the deacons are about to bring to the holy altar the bread of the prothesis and the recently mixed chalice (τὸ κερασθὲν ἀρτίως ποτήριον), reckless are those who allow the people to say some psalmic hymn suitable (as they think) to the act being done, to offer or even to greet as the King of Glory the things carried in and which are not yet perfected by the hierarchal invocation and sanctification shining forth on them." Next, he invokes the authority of Athanasios the Great, who writes that, "as long as the supplications and prayers are not yet done [the gifts being offered], it is mere bread" (*Oration concerning Holy Pascha and the Holy Eucharist* 9).[696]

693. PG 121:748b; Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae 13 (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 1:685. Geōrgios Kedrēnos (Γεώργιος Κεδρηνός), a twelfth-century Byzantine historian about which little is known, authored a history (Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν) from the creation of the world to 1057. See Alexander Kazhdan, "Kedrenos, George," *ODB* 2:1118.

694. "ὕμνος ψαλμικός."

695. "βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης."

696. Eutychios of Constantinople, *Oration concerning Pascha and the Holy Eucharist* (*Λόγος περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα καὶ τῆς ἁγίας εὐχαριστίας*) 9 (PG 86:2400c–2401a). The quotation from Saint Athanasios the Great appears

The two important witnesses above are not completely consistent. Eutychios is very close to matters and his testimony is completely reliable. He mentions "a psalmic hymn," which contains the phrase "King of Glory." We said that this is the twenty-third psalm, which indeed is preserved up until nowadays as an entrance psalm in the Armenian liturgical form and is also encountered in Byzantine manuscripts as a verse said in a dialogue by the celebrants during the entrance of the gifts into the altar ("Raise up the gates...,"[697] "Who is this..."[698]).[699] Kedrēnos is separated by nearly five centuries from that period and probably falls into an anachronism when confusing the psalmic antiphon with the somewhat later Cherubic hymn, which certainly does not contain the phrase, "βασιλέα τῆς δόξης" (King of Glory), but "βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων" (king of all). However, in any case, the psalm influenced ecclesiastical poetry, the authors of prayers, and the whole rubric of the great entrance. And the Byzantine cheroubikon "Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim...," the Jerusalemite "Let all mortal flesh keep silent...,"[700] "Now the powers of the heavens..."[701] of the Presanctified, the prayer of the Cherubic hymn "No one is worthy...,"[702] as well as "May the Lord God remember us in his kingdom..."[703] of the entrance were strongly influenced by the twenty-third psalm. When the Cherubic hymn was composed, in all likelihood it was chanted

---

to be a fragment preserved in Eutychios. For an alternate translation and a discussion of this sermon as well as the historical development of the cheroubikon, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. II, The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites*, OCA 200, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004), 84–86, 70–76. Also see the excellent summary on the cheroubikon by Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 166–167. Compare the discussion in Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 35–39.

697. "Ἄρατε πύλας..."
698. "Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος..."
699. See questions 88 and 228.
700. "Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σὰρξ βροτεία..."
701. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν..."
702. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."
703. "Πάντων ἡμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ..."

in parallel with the twenty-third psalm during its stichologia, just as it is done even nowadays in the Armenian liturgical form. Afterwards, it became prevalent for the cheroubikon to be chanted alone without stichologia, just as it was also done with the trisagion hymn. In any case, it appears that they did not chant it only one time. As a remnant of this practice, its chanting three times during Pascha remained up until at least the twelfth century ("One must know that 'Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim…' is said three times on this day," Typikon of Saint Sophia from the ninth century)[704] or even three times on Great Saturday ("And we chant the cheroubikon three times; the two rapidly, and the third slowly," Typikon of the monastery of the Savior of Messina, the year 1131)[705] and on Pascha ("The cheroubikon is chanted a third time today as also on Great Saturday," Typikon of the monastery of the Savior of Messina, the year 1131).[706]

It is apparent that it is impossible to determine at what point the entrance of the gifts took place during the chanting of the psalm (or the chanting of the stichologia of the psalm together with the Cherubic hymn or of the triple chanting of the cheroubikon, which survived for a while during Pascha or even also nowadays with its triple recitation by the celebrants, or even when finally it became prevalent for it to be chanted only one time). Its development is so complex. But also, the development of its section of the Divine Liturgy complicates matters even more. The proskomidē developed into quite a lengthy semi-independent service and was transferred to the start, prior to the enarxis of the Liturgy. The prayer, "No one is worthy…," was introduced from the Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian. Not only the deacons, as initially, but also the priests began to take part in the entrance. "May the Lord God remember us in his

704. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:96–97.

705. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 246–247.

706. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 250.

kingdom..." began to be said and the transfer of the precious gifts to the altar acquired a character of an actual procession.

It is certain that the entrance of the gifts originally took place in silence, just as in the Presanctified, obviously after the psalm or the Cherubic hymn (or even during their chanting). The break at "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα" (That the king) and the continuation of the chanting after the entrance from "τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι" (of all we may receive) has in its favor not only the relatively older contemporary practice as well as the kratēma that we encounter in the musical manuscripts and old printed editions, but even this somewhat artless and abrupt nature of the break. It does not stop the chanting at a place somewhat smoother, at a comma, but in the middle of a sentence, as if something extraordinary and unexpected is going to happen. The other two breaks appear to be later, namely, as if they were caused by an attempt at correction, after some grammatical or conceptual concern that attempted to correct something that seemed incorrect. And in a sense, it is, but must be intentional, like a kind of musical game. The other two breaks attempt to preserve a more logical division, at least for them to fall at a comma, since the hymn, which is written as a single composition (a kind of apostrophe[707] to the people), only consists of a lengthy period.[708]

As for the theological objection of Saint Eutychios, it appears that it was not completely forgotten. The development of the service of the prothesis into a semi-independent service (as we characterized it above), the transfer of the prayer of the prothesis prior to the entrance or even prior to the Liturgy, emphasized the sacredness of the gifts, which are no longer simple bread and common wine, but "precious gifts" that have already been offered to God and already are "holy," "antitypes" of the Body and Blood of the Lord. For this reason, also, they are covered and censed and, in this regard, venerated and honored, and during the great entrance corresponding

707. "Apostrophe" (ἀποστροφή) is used here in its rhetorical sense as an "addressing."

708. Phountoulês is referring to a "musical period," which is a unit or composition that is made up of two balanced phrases in succession, the second making the first more complete.

honors are ascribed to them by the people.[709] There certainly also existed objections to this honor, similar to that of Saint Eutychios, not only from outsiders in discussions with the Latins, but also from those within. Perhaps also popular piety sometimes confused matters, and for this reason Nikolaos Kabasilas takes corrective action in the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, when condemning excesses and placing the faithful's honor of the gifts and expressions of piety on a correct theological foundation: "But if some of those who prostrate before the priest entering with the gifts into the sanctuary both worship and address the gifts carried as the Body and Blood of Christ, they have been misled by the entrance of the Presanctified Gifts, not perceiving the difference between this sacred-service and that one. For this one in this entrance has the gifts unsacrificed and not yet completed, but the other, complete and sanctified and the Body and Blood of Christ" (chapter 24.5).[710] Saint Eutychios also precisely wished to avoid this. Those to whom Kabasilas is referring fell into this misinterpretation that the former points out. They thought that the gifts are the "king of all" of the Cherubic hymn or the "King of Glory" of the twenty-third psalm.

However, the meaning of the Cherubic hymn and the twenty-third psalm from which it is inspired, is not this. The cheroubikon does not refer to the entrance of the gifts but constitutes an entrance hymn to the whole performance of the Holy Eucharist, which begins from the offering of the Church's gifts in the altar in order be consecrated into the Body and Blood of Christ and for the faithful to commune of them. The laying aside of earthly cares by the faithful who are imitating the angels relates to the whole celebration of the mystery, and the chanting of the trisagion hymn

709. Even nowadays, the distinction between common bread and offered bread continues to exist in Greek culture. For example, when prosphora are not used for a Liturgy, they are customarily distributed to pious needy people because it is thought that the bread will not be discarded but consumed with respect. In addition, there are priests who graciously accept all prosphora, but quietly discriminate and prefer those that were made at home in prayer as opposed to those purchased at commercial bakeries.

710. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 24.5 (SC 4bis:164–165).

to the offering together with the Cherubim and Seraphim of the trisagion/triumphal hymn during the prayer of the holy anaphora, the reception of the King in holy communion. The explanation of the Cherubic hymn is brief and succinct, which Saint Theodōros of Andida provides us in his explanatory commentary on the Divine Liturgy that is entitled, *Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 18: "The Cherubic hymn being sung urges all to have their minds directed more attentively henceforth and until the end of the sacred-service, leaving aside below all earthly care, as ones about to receive a great king through communion."[711]

We already said that the break of the hymn for the entrance of the gifts at "ὑποδεξόμενοι" (may receive) probably must be considered owed to a learned— "theological"—intervention. It is possible that some gave it an analogous meaning to that of Saint Eutychios for the phrase "βασιλέα τῆς δόξης" (King of Glory) of the twenty-third psalm. "Ὑποδεξόμενοι" (may receive) ought to be chanted, according to this interpretation, prior to the entrance, as an exhortation for the reception of the king of all by the faithful through the precious gifts during the great entrance. The proposed correction by some of "ὑποδεξόμενοι" (may receive) to "ὑποδεξάμενοι" (having received), when it is chanted after the entrance, is owed to analogous mistaken interpretations. Apart from the fact that, according to the above, this is a theological error and that no such a writing is attested to by the manuscripts, a syntactical mistake with this correction is also caused in the grammatically and syntactically well-tested Cherubic hymn. The context of the phrase, "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι" (that we may receive the king of all), requires a definitive participle and future tense. "Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξάμενοι" (That we have received the king of all) is syntactically inappropriate.

711. PG 140:441b.

551

Some priests are accustomed to read the prayers of the Divine Liturgy "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως). Others read them "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) as the service books prescribe and as a pertinent encyclical of the Sacred Synod requires. Which is more correct?[712]

552

According to the standard rubric, the prayers of the antiphons of the Divine Liturgy, "It is proper and right to hymn you..."[713] **or the corresponding prayer, "O Master, He who is, Lord God... "**[714] **of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the prayer of inclination, and many others are said, "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) while the chanter chants the antiphons or "It is proper and right"**[715] **or "To you, O Lord."**[716] **Is it possible for lengthy prayers to be covered by phrases so small as the above?**

---

712. The Greek terms "μυστικῶς," an adverb that is translated as "inaudibly," and "ἐκφώνως," an adverb that is translated "in an exclamatory manner," will be left untranslated at certain points in this question in order to allow for Phountoulēs's discussion of their meaning. Regarding the meaning of "ἐκφώνως," Phountoulēs states in question 410:

> The ἐκφώνησις (exclamation) is the doxological epilogue of every single prayer, which is chanted melodically: ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner). Namely, we can characterize the expression, ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner) as a type of musical term, parallel to the phrase ἐκφωνητικὴ ψαλμῳδία (exclamatory chanting), which denotes the mode of melodious reading of sacred texts. In contrast, the prayer constitutes the main body of the text and is read either 'εἰς ἐπήκοον' (within earshot) of the people, according to the more ancient taxis, which still applies even today in the sacred mysteries apart from the Divine Liturgy, or 'μυστικῶς' (inaudibly), as became prevalent later in the prayers of the Divine Liturgy and of certain other services, namely of Vespers and Matins.

The "exclamatory chanting" can be compared to the singing used for dialogue and narrative in operas and oratorios.

713. "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν..."

714. "Ὁ ὢν Δέσποτα, Κύριε Θεέ..."

715. "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον."

716. "Σοί, Κύριε."

553

What is the meaning of the reading of prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς)? If their content is, in some manner, confidential,[717] then why is the use of Enkolpia[718] for the Divine Liturgy established and permitted, and the publication and circulation of Hieratika permitted?

All three questions above, in different variations, have at times been submitted by many. Just as also the subject of kneeling, which was addressed in the recent answers 547 and 548, so also the subject of the reading of the Divine Liturgy's prayers "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) or "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) has caused disputes and polarizations in recent years, which do not favor its required unprejudiced and objective judgment and serious treatment. Unfortunately, this also has been involved in our usual petty squabbles and we play with something "not to be trifled with."[719] We will attempt to study below the disputed topic within the limits that these answers operate, with the required respect for the viewpoints on either side. In any case, the fact is comforting that the Ecumenical Patriarch himself recently pointed out the necessity for a study of the subject. Namely, it is not, as it is usually thought, a "closed" topic and does not depend on any of our preferences or religious attitudes. And let us begin with this latter point by speaking honestly and clearly. The fact that the reading "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) of prayers was adopted in our country[720] by clergy belonging or

717. "ἀπόρρητο." The notion that the texts could be considered confidential refers to the possible understanding of the word, "μυστικῶς," as "secretly." In Modern Greek usage, the adjective "μυστικός, ή, όν" means "secret."

718. "Ἐγκόλπια" (Enkolpia, sing. Ἐγκόλπιον, τό, Enkolpion), in this context, a handbook used by the faithful in order to follow liturgical services, but also in other uses, a medallion on which an icon is written, which is worn by hierarchs. However, the term can also designate an abridged version of the Hôrologion used by readers and chanters for the celebration of Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy. See also the discussion in Stephanos Alexopoulos–Dionysios Bilalis Anatolikiotēs, "Towards a History of Printed Liturgical Books in the Modern Greek State: An Initial Survey," *Ecclesia orans* 34 (2017): 446–447. In the latter use, this book can also be known as the "Sylleitourgikon."

719. "ἐν οὐ παικτοῖς."

720. Greece.

well-disposed to religious organizations that appeared within and outside of our country during our century,[721] from one point of view, probably harmed the whole matter. Namely, it caused negative attitudes of others because this manner of reciting the prayers was the same as that of the religious organizations.[722]

Let us not repeat what we wrote regarding the subject of kneeling as it pertains to the attempt to rekindle liturgical life, which was done in recent years by clergy, sacred preachers, and theologians.[723] One element of this effort was the reading of the prayers "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) as well as the active distribution of "Enkolpia" and explanations of the Divine Liturgy into the people's hands. The purpose here is both obvious and sacred. Namely, to let the people participate in what is being celebrated, directly approaching the sacred text of the prayers, whether listening or reading the texts from appropriate supplementary books. The fact that the clergy belonging to a specific religious movement (which essentially was the only one existing during the first half of our century) adopted this approach, is entirely incidental. The same reasons cause the same results in various directions. From the sporadic witnesses that survived, it appears that the Kollybades, although monks of the Holy Mountain, while studying the Fathers and attempting to revitalize the liturgical piety of the faithful, already came to read aloud the prayers of the Divine Liturgy in order for them to be heard by the people.[724] A tireless hierarch of blessed memory, at the time Metropolitan of Karystia and Skyros, also did the same thing, as well as other respected clergymen, who were anything but close to or influenced by the organizations. Specifically, the later professor

721. The twentieth century.

722. The religious organizations referenced were formed by theologians, clergy, and laity, and were societies such as Ζωή, Ὁ Σωτήρ, and others. For an overview and history of these societies, see Christos Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*, trans. by Peter Chamberas and Norman Russell (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006), 217–250.

723. Phountoulēs is alluding to his criticism of such individuals in debate concerning kneeling during the consecration of the precious gifts.

724. See question 546 for a discussion of the Kollybades (Κολλυβάδες), who predate any of the aforementioned societies or organizations.

of the Theological School of the University of Athens, Panagiōtēs Trempelas of eternal memory, a profound student of the history and theology of Divine worship, had delved into the study of this subject and through the religious organization,[725] of which he was a founding member and active participant, attempted to influence our liturgical affairs with the aim of the better participation of the people in divine worship, which besides also was on the agenda of the Holy and Great Council to be assembled in the future.[726] He also taught this at the University, when he was later a professor, and this was implemented in model Liturgies of the University temple during student liturgical synaxes. In our contemporary era, quite a few bishops and priests followed the same practice because they were guided to this by their personal liturgical studies and by their pastoral care for the participation of the faithful people in what was being performed, without having any relation to or influence from religious organizations. Certainly, one of our most learned contemporary bishops not only theoretically supported and implemented in practice the reading of the prayers "within earshot" (εἰς ἐπήκοον) of the people, but also introduced the term "χαμηλοφώνως" (in a low voice) instead of the traditional term, "μυστικῶς" (inaudibly), due to the misinterpretations that are given to the latter.

Subsequently, we will attempt to view the subject of reading prayers "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) or "in exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) somewhat more systematically. And the first thing that needs to be clarified is the meaning of these two terms.

The first, "μυστικῶς," is an old term, which is already encountered in the first surviving liturgical manuscripts, for designation of prayers that are read in a recitation style and in a low tone. It is does not mean something "secret" (μυστικό)[727] in the modern meaning of the term: confidentiality, what is not said, or what is not permitted to be heard. It is identical with another parallel term that is encountered more rarely: "κατὰ τὸ σεσιωπημένον" (in an unspoken manner).

725. Ζωή.

726. This item was not on the final agenda of the Holy and Great Council of 2016.

727. In Modern Greek, the adjective "μυστικός, ή, όν" means "secret."

This is about purely technical and not theological terminology. It is opposed to the term "ἐκφώνως" that prefixes (similarly from a very early period) the melodic doxological conclusions of prayers, which, according to this rubric, prescribes that they are said, "ἐκφωνητικῶς," in a tone higher than the prayers and with a simple musical recitation. Certain prayers were said "ἐκφωνητικῶς," "μεγάλῃ" (in a loud) or "λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ" (clear voice), such as the prayers of the Hagiasmos of Theophany and of holy baptism. Others without being heard by the people, not because they had something that ought not to be heard by them because they were esoteric, but because it related to the priest personally and not to the community. Such ones are in the Divine Liturgy, the "prayer of the Cherubic hymn"[728] in the Byzantine form ("No one is worthy…");[729] or the prayers "O compassionate and merciful God…"[730] and "O Lord Jesus Christ God, the Only Begotten Son…"[731] of holy baptism and the Great Hagiasmos respectively. The celebrant said these "to himself" (καθ'ἑαυτόν) or "silently" (καθ'ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ)[732] according to the standard rubric of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, also showing in this manner that the grace of God accomplishes the mysteries through the priesthood, regardless of whether or to what extent the priest is worthy or unworthy for this action.[733] We earlier wrote about this topic in connection with the phrase, "and do not hinder the grace of Your Holy Spirit from these gifts presented on account of my sins [of the celebrant]"[734] of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great (question number 411). The remaining prayers (which relate to the community, either are perfecting of the mysteries or prayers for various occasions or even those of the synaxis and of the Divine Liturgy) were always (πάντοτε) said within earshot of the people. Not "ἐκφώνως"

728. "εὐχὴ τοῦ χερουβικοῦ ὕμνου."
729. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος…"
730. "Ὁ εὔσπλαγχνος καὶ ἐλέημων Θεός…"
731. "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός…"
732. Literally, "to himself within himself."
733. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 76, 86, 88, 92.
734. "καὶ μὴ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας κωλύσῃς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δώρων."

with the meaning that we detailed above, namely, melodically, such as the conclusions of prayers. The confusion in terms causes or is a result of a confusion also in matters. "Εκφώνως" is one thing and "εἰς ἐπήκοον" (within earshot) is another. "Εκφώνως" means "melodically" (μελωδικά); "εἰς ἐπήκοον" (within earshot) means "audibly" (ἀκουστά) as to be heard by the faithful. This has significance. When we find the term "ἐκφώνως" or "ἐκφώνησις," this does not necessarily mean that the text of the prayer was not audible. It could be or not be audible. Conversely, with the term "μυστικῶς," when it prefixes the prayer, we have a clear indication that the prayer was read by the priest in a low tone, without being heard by the faithful.

We used the word "always" (πάντοτε) above in the sense of genesis, of a starting point, until a different practice became prevalent; the prayers being said without being heard by the people present. This is about a quite old custom. The first witness for it comes in the time of Justinian (sixth century), and it appears that it quickly became widespread. We will return to this, after we first attempt to see the original tradition and taxis and to explain the reasons that led to the change.

Professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas of blessed memory in his pertinent study in connection with the "liturgical movement" in the Western Church, which highlighted the deviations reached during the Middle Ages and the attempt for a return to the practice of the ancient undivided Church that was basically preserved in the worship of the Eastern Orthodox Church (as well as in his other special study), gathered all the relevant material and witnesses that address this subject. It is clear that both before the prayers were yet written and after their recording they were always said within earshot of the people. The enumeration of all these witnesses would take too long. And the prayer of the anaphora alone, this key element of the Liturgy, constitutes the most serious argument.[735] It is very extensive, is

735. For another discussion of the anaphora's reading, see Robert Taft, "Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of It," in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East: An International Symposium in Honor of the 40th Anniversary of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary*, ed. Roberta R. Ervine (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006), 15–57.

in the form of a dialogue between celebrant and people, and in no way is its coverage possible by the answers of the people, which are brief and presuppose the priestly prayer, just as also the continuation of the priestly prayer presupposes the response of the people. This not only applies regarding the Byzantine Liturgies, but much more regarding the Liturgies of the other forms of the East, of Iakōvos, Markos, and so forth. Theoretically, there is no such thing as a celebration of the Divine Liturgy or of other mysteries and sacred rites and an offering of prayers, without them being understood by the people, by the Church of God, on behalf and for the sake of which they are offered. The priest is the mouth, not of a mute church, but of the people of God who with boldness address themselves towards God the Father through the priest and participate in what is being said by him. This basically is the request for "logical" worship in Christ ("λογικῆς" ἐν Χριστῷ λατρείας), of worship "in Spirit and truth."[736] For this reason, also the Apostle Paul prefers "five words" that are understandable by the people, who participate with "Amen" in the presider's giving of thanks, rather than the "ten thousand" unintelligible words of those who had the enviable charism of the Spirit, the charism of tongues (1 Corinthians 14:1–33). And nowadays, "the one in the position of the uninstructed"[737] says "Amen," but when the prayer is said inaudibly (μυστικῶς), does not know what the celebrant is saying. And he "gives thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified."[738] The "Amen" no longer refers to the prayer, but to a series of doxological exclamations, which give reasons for the content of a prayer that was not heard. This chapter of the First Letter to the Corinthians ought to make us also particularly ask questions nowadays. It has eternal authority.

Before anyone attempts to explain the reason that caused the reading of the prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς), it would be opportune and very conducive for the discovery of a correct solution, in some manner, to reconnoiter the territory. As is well known, all the prayers of the Divine Liturgy are nowadays said "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς), apart

736. John 4:24.
737. 1 Corinthians 14:16.
738. 1 Corinthians 14:17.

from the prayer behind the ambōn. The prayers of Lamp-lighting and Matins during the introductory psalm and the Six Psalms respectively are similarly said inaudibly (μυστικῶς), as well as the prayers of inclination for these services. It is noteworthy that all these prayers are said in the holy bēma and before the holy table. Conversely, all the prayers that are said outside of the holy bēma, such as the prayer behind the ambōn of the Divine Liturgy, are said within earshot of the people (εἰς ἐπήκοον τοῦ λαοῦ). This must make us ask questions. Perhaps the solution is not found where we suspected, namely, in the sublimity of the mystery, but in another direction. If the reason for reading inaudibly (μυστικῶς) was the first, then it would justify the reading of the prayer of the anaphora inaudibly, despite the fact that its dialogic format and its length contradict this. But in any case, this prayer is the key part of the Divine Liturgy, so it carries the weight of the mystery of the remembrance and the change of the gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ. However, by the same reasoning, the consecratory prayers of the other mysteries and sacred rites also ought to be said "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς). Nevertheless, the prayers for holy baptism, prayers for marriage, prayers for Hagiasmoi, prayers for unction, prayers for dedications,[739] occasional prayers, funereal prayers, the prayers of kneeling for Pentecost, and so forth, are said within earshot of the people (εἰς ἐπήκοον τοῦ λαοῦ). Similarly, the prayers for the imposition of hands are said within earshot and of ordination inaudibly (μυστικῶς). The first ones outside of the bēma, but of ordinations within. The solution of the enigma is perhaps found at this point.

When a text is melodically (ἐμμελῶς) read, such as the readings and the exclamations of prayers, it is virtually impossible to be heard in large synaxes. When it is read in a recitation style[740] it is heard with difficulty if indeed the one who reads it is elderly or weak voiced. Much more if he is not turned towards the people, but in the opposite direction, such as became prevalent in the past to be done in divine worship, and when the synaxes are not small, but crowded and are indeed done in large-scale places of worship. It

739. Namely, the consecration of temples.

740. "σὲ ὕφος ἀναγνώσεως."

is quite possible that all these factors contributed to the prevalence of reading inaudibly (μυστικῶς). Just as often happens in worship matters, necessity became a love of honor[741] and asked to be covered under the sacred garment of theology and symbolisms.

Here is how Theodōros, bishop of Andida, explains and justifies the reading of prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς) in his explanatory treatise on the Divine Liturgy, *Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy,* in connection with the reading of the prayer behind the ambōn within earshot of the people (εἰς ἐπήκοον τοῦ λαοῦ): "The prayer behind the ambōn is, so to speak, a seal of all the entreaties and a summary drawn up in order, appropriate to what was recited both earlier and more splendidly... For since some of those standing outside of the altar often persist in perplexity, while being conflicted and saying: 'What actually is the purpose and the meaning and efficacy of the prayers whispered softly by the hierarch?' And they desire to receive some knowledge of them. Accordingly, the divine Fathers made the character of this prayer as a summary of all the things asked by the prayers, teaching by the fringe those seeking the garment" (chapter 38).[742]

The sacred Nikolaos Kabasilas in his work, *On the Divine Liturgy*, again in connection with the prayer behind the ambōn and the manner and place of its recitation, gives the following a more theological explanation. He juxtaposes the offering of the prayers of the Divine Liturgy "within the altar" and "nobody hearing" (μηδενὸς ἀκούοντος) by the priest "by himself," to the reading of the prayer behind the ambōn outside of the sanctuary, in the midst of the people, and "all hearing" (πάντων ἀκουόντων). The former expresses

741. "φιλοτιμία." In other words, the problems associated with reading prayers aloud caused them to be inaudible and a justification for what was caused by necessity ended up being sought in symbolisms and "theology."

742. PG 140:465b–465c; "ἐκ τοῦ κρασπέδου τὸ ὕφασμα," cf. Matthew 9:20, 14:36; Luke 8:44; Mark, 6:56. Compare the translation in Robert Taft, "Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of it," in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East: An International Symposium in Honor of the 40th Anniversary of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary*, ed. Roberta R. Ervine (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006)," 42.

the celebrant's "communion with God,"[743] the second the descent from "that height" "to the speech of humanity."[744] The priest appears "descending and does this in a sacred befitting manner. For he does this while also praying. And the manner of the prayer and the place show him descending" (chapter 53).[745] The justification is obviously weak. The prayers of Matins and Vespers, as well as the first prayers of the Divine Liturgy up until also the prayer for the catechumens, are equivalent to that behind the ambōn. They refer to common entreaties that do not have a direct relationship to the mystery. Indeed, the second prayer of Matins and the prayer of the second antiphon of the Divine Liturgy mention the same entreaties as the one behind the ambōn, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you...,"[746] with the same words and phrases. Moreover, all are composed in the plural form as a speech towards God not only of the interceding priest, but of the entirety of the sacred synaxis, the entire Church. Moreover, most of them reshape into a form of prayer and present to God entreaties and thanksgivings that are contained in psalms that the people chanted after them according to the system of the "asmatic" antiphons of the ancient parish Typikon. They do not have a consecratory character that would even somewhat justify their recitation not in earshot (τὴν μὴ εἰς ἐπήκοον ἀναγγελία τους). For example, such are the prayers of the invariable antiphons of the "asmatic" Matins (first, second, third, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth ōthina prayers) and of the "asmatic" Vespers (first, second, and the prayer of lamp-lighting—the contemporary prayer for the entrance of the monastic Vespers).

In stark contrast to the simple prayers of the synaxis, which we mentioned above—which, according to our observation, while they are not consecratory prayers, are said inaudibly (μυστικῶς), since the taxis provides for them to be said within the holy bema and it was not possible for them to be heard outside—another series of

743. "μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ συναναστῆναι."
744. "εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁμιλίαν."
745. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 53.3–4 (SC 4bis:304).
746. "Ὁ εὐλογῶν τοὺς εὐλογοῦντας σε, Κύριε ..."

prayers is found. These are the prayers for the times of prayer[747]: Midnight Office, First, Third, Sixth and Ninth Hours, Compline, as well as the private prayers prior and after holy communion. While these also are not consecratory—which, naturally, are said only by the celebrant, the priest—most of them are euchological texts of the highest importance and of wonderful inspiration and structure. These prayers are said by the presider or the reader, always in earshot (εἰς ἐπήκοον), obviously because they are said outside of the bēma.

However, do not perhaps also the troparia (at least most) have a similar character to the prayers? As a community's prayer, do they not also refer to God and highlight in a wonderful poetic manner the mysteries of the faith and the Church's devotional practice? They are always said and chanted by the people, and no one ever contemplated characterizing them as, in some manner, confidential, or contemplated suggesting their recitation inaudibly (μυστικῶς). Indeed, some of them, according to the modern custom, are said during the time of the Divine Liturgy by the priest at the same time that the prayers are also said, namely, "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) without being heard by the people. Here, it is most obvious that their recitation inaudibly (μυστικῶς) cannot in any manner be correlated with the concealment of the mystery from the praying community. Because this was also said as a justification of the reading of the prayers not within earshot of the people (εἰς ἐπήκοον τοῦ λαοῦ).

The oldest practice of "concealment of the mysteries"[748] has no relationship to the reading of the prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς). This concerned and concerns those not initiated, namely, those not Christians, even if they already belonged to the orders of "hearers,"[749] "catechumens," or even of "those preparing for illumination." There do not exist inaudible or hidden things for the faithful. Revelation is full and common for all the members of the Church's body baptized in Christ. There does not exist one theological teaching for the people and another for the clergy. The sifting out is done after the prayer for the catechumens and the faithful who remain in the synaxis are

747. "τὶς εὐχὲς τῶν καιρῶν τῆς προσευχῆς."
748. "ἀποκρύψεως τῶν μυστηρίων."
749. "ἀκροωμένων."

called to prayer, to give thanks to the Lord, to attend the celebration of the mystery, and to welcome the King of all through communion. For this reason, also, the Church with preaching, with readings, with mystagogical catechesis, and with all its spiritual means attempts to catechize Christians for fuller participation in its mysteries of the faith and worship. It would be contradictory and inconceivable for all these things to be done, for us to circulate thousands of copies of liturgical texts, and for us to maintain that the prayers are inaudibly (μυστικῶς) read because the mysteries must be concealed from the faithful. A "mystery" for the faithful, clergy and people, does not mean confidential, but that which the human mind does not hold. Not that they do not know that the bread and wine of our offering are changed by the invocation of the Holy Spirit into Christ's Body and Blood or the water during holy baptism is transmuted by the prayers into the "water of regeneration,"[750] but that the manner of the Holy Spirit's activity is incomprehensible. Sometime during the dark years of the Middle Ages in the West, this question was both stated and raised whether it is permitted for the lay members of the Church to read the liturgical texts and to hear the prayers of the Holy Eucharist. I wonder, does the custom of the inaudible reading of the prayers come from that place and those times? Without us following the easy route of the attribution of all evils to the West, nothing precludes such an influence. We also saw it in the question of kneeling. The Western Church also gradually and with great effort advanced to the final purification from the distortions of the Middle Ages in its worship. However, did they create a new tradition for us?

We said that the practice for the reading of the prayers "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς) or "in an unspoken manner" (κατὰ τὸ σεσιωπημένον) is attested to for the first time already during the sixth century. This is Justinian's Novel 137.6 which was published during the year 565.[751] A most important text, which we quote verbatim:

"In addition, we command that all the bishops and presbyters do the holy oblation and prayer for holy baptism not in an unspoken

750. "ὕδωρ ἀναγεννήσεως."

751. The mistaken identification of the text as from Novel 139 is corrected to Novel 137 above.

manner (κατὰ τὸ σεσιωπημένον), but with a voice audible to the most faithful people (τῷ πιστοτάτῳ λαῷ), so that hence the souls of those listening are aroused to greater contrition and glorification towards the Lord God. For so also the divine apostle teaches, when saying in the First Letter to the Corinthians: 'Otherwise, if you bless with the Spirit, how can one in the position of the uninstructed say the 'Amen' to your thanksgivings when he does not know what you are saying? For you may give thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified.'[752] And he again so states in the Letter to the Romans: 'For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, but with the mouth one confesses unto salvation.'[753] Therefore, on account of these things, it is fitting for the prayer over the holy oblation and other prayers to be offered aloud by the most blessed bishops and presbyters to our Lord Jesus Christ, our God, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the most blessed priests knowing that if indeed they might neglect any of these things, they will answer to the awesome judgment of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ and neither when learning these things will we acquiesce or leave them unpunished."[754]

It must not surprise us that a question that relates to matters internal to the liturgical life of the Church becomes a law of the state, namely, an imperial Novel. Even the decisions of Ecumenical Councils were issued in this form and the Church institutionalized and published its decisions in this way. This is a robust theological text, which with biblical and dogmatic arguments strengthens liturgical deontology and with rigor attempts to curtail the tendencies of reciting the prayers of the Divine Liturgy ("of the oblation")[755] and of holy baptism "in an unspoken manner" (κατὰ τὸ σεσιωπημένον). The expression, "to the most faithful people" (τῷ πιστοτάτῳ λαῷ) and the whole argumentation leave the impression that the proponents of the new custom, namely, of reading the prayers inaudibly

752. 1 Corinthians 14:16–17 (Revised Standard modified).

753. Romans 10:10.

754. Rudolf Schöll and Wilhelm Kross, eds., Justinian, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3. *Novellae* (Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1954), 699.

755. "προσκομιδῆς."

(μυστικῶς), attempted to take cover behind theological arguments, similar to those that we have already encountered.

The scholarly monk Neophytos Kavsokalyvitēs (eighteenth century) produced a wonderful very extensive commentary on the Novel above, and it is included in his massive *Nomokanōn*, which still remains unpublished.[756] It is not possible for us to quote this text due to its length, but when reading it, one admires the biblical, patristic, and theological wisdom of the author and the brilliant way in which these divinely illuminated teachers of Orthodoxy and of the Nation, the Kollybades, comprehended and set forth the Church's true and ancient tradition. They drew directly from the sources and asked questions under the light of patristic teaching regarding what is correct and what is not correct in our contemporary ecclesiastical life. Namely, they gave a dynamic meaning to tradition, which they considered, as it also is, forever living and life-giving and not static and fossilized.[757]

Be that as it may, the reading of prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς) did not stop with Justinian's Novel, at least with regard to the Divine Liturgy. The "theological" reasons were addressed by the Church

756. Neophytos Kavsokalyvitēs (*Νεόφυτος ὁ Καυσοκαλυβίτης*) studied at Patmos initially and then in Ioannina with Eugenios Voulgarēs (Εὐγένιος ὁ Βούλγαρης) (1716–1806), after which he became a monk of Mount Athos at Kavsokalyvia. Although there is disagreement, prevailing scholarship dates his life 1713–1784. He taught at the Athonite Academy of Voulgarēs and at other institutions in Chios, Ioannina, Adrianople, Brasov of Transylvania, Constantinople, and Bucharest. He was the author of a work known as the *Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν Ἱερῶν Κανόνων* (*Epitome of the Sacred Canons*), which was begun during the author's stay on Mount Athos (up to 1759 or 1760) with progressive additions throughout his life. The work is contained in manuscript 295 (222) of the Academy of Bucharest, (Constantin Litzica, *Catagogul Manuscriptelor Greceşti* [Bucharest: "Carol Göbel, 1909], 150). This summary is based on Νικόλαος Σικλαφίδης, *Ἡ περὶ τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας ἀλληλογραφία τοῦ Νεοφύτου Καυσοκαλυβίτου μὲ τοὺς Εὐγένιο Βούλγαρη καὶ Νικηφόρο Θεοτόκη* (PhD diss., Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης Θεολογική Σχολή, 2016), 16–17 (http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/287709/files/GRI-2017-18533.pdf, accessed November 3, 2021), Γεώργιος Μεταλληνός, *Ὁμολογῶ ἓν βάπτισμα* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκδόσεις Τῆνος, 1996), 8, n. 12, and Θεοδώρητος Μοναχός, "Ὁ Νομοκανών Νεοφύτου τοῦ Καυσοκαλυβίτου," *Κοινωνία* 18 (1975): 197–206.

757. See the discussion of the influence of the Kollybades on Phountoulēs as discussed by Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs in volume one.

with this Novel, but the practical reasons that caused the reading inaudibly (μυστικῶς) did not disappear. The fact that they played a key role is apparent by the outcome of the practice. The prayers of holy baptism were said at the baptistery or in the middle of the temple and could be heard. However, regarding the prayers of the Divine Liturgy, there existed an inherent difficulty and their reading de facto could not be heard by the people. Thus, they fell back again into "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς). New factors also contributed to this, namely, the gradual raising of the templon, and perhaps the celebration of the Divine Liturgy by the priest alone without the participation of a deacon, which over the years became more and more frequent. The results were and are nowadays apparent. The prolonged silence, for the offering of prayers by the priest during the especially great synaxes, caused the necessary displacements of the prayers during the antiphons, the trisagion, the diaconal synapses, the allēlouarion or, later, during the reading of the epistle, the recitation of the Symbol, or the koinōnikon. Thus, the reverse reading of the prayer after its exclamation, or its unbinding from it, was brought about. The exclamations, as stronger elements, remained in their place. The prayers, as truly weaker although more important essentially, suffered all the consequences of corruption. The priest when praying, in some manner, was detached and became independent from the worshipping community, since at the time of the diaconal petitions or of the chanting of the antiphons and the trisagion he reads the prayers, does not participate in the recitation of the sacred Symbol and the Lord's Prayer, and is preoccupied with other actions during the reading of the epistle text. Of course, the solution was concocted for him to privately recite the trisagion, the sacred Symbol and the "Our Father,"[758] and to continue or to place the prayers beforehand (which by necessity he omitted) saying them, in the best case, hurriedly. In addition, the efforts made by the choir for covering the space with the artistic chanting of the leitourgika,[759]

758. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..."

759. "Λειτουργικά." This term refers to a small collection of Byzantine chant music to cover the priest parts and responses after the Cherubic hymn up until "It is meet..." (Ἄξιόν ἐστιν), which varies on feasts; or the parts and

not only corrupted the tradition of their plain responsorial recitation, but also shifted the center of gravity from the priest to the chanter, without again making possible the covering of the prayer's reading with a "To you, O Lord,"[760] not matter how dragged out it is. This is obvious even in the Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos, but more obvious in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great with its very long and theological prayers. One often wonders when and how the priest managed to read them, when neither, according to the saying, "with the eye,"[761] is one able to go through them in such a short time.

However, aside from this unacceptable impious disorder (let it be permitted for me to characterize this as such), the more serious consequence of the reading of the prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς) is the conversion of the Divine Liturgy into a series of doxological exclamations (which justify an unheard text), chants, and actions, which do not have an independent meaning without the prayers. Thus, the remembrance of the Lord and of His redemptive work, which is the purpose of the celebration of the Divine Liturgy according to the Lord's command, "Do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19, 1 Corinthians 11:24–25), was narrowed down to "Take, eat..."[762] and "Drink of it, all..."[763] and to the sacred spectacle and its symbolical explanations. Thus, according to varied symbolisms, the believer is invited to see Christ coming into the world in the entrance of the Gospel book; His triumphal entrance into Jerusalem or His carrying out as dead or His second coming in the great entrance; His Resur-

---

responses themselves. Music is provided to cover the changes in tone, usually to match that of the Cherubic hymn. For an example, see Βασίλειος Κ. Νικολαΐδης, *Λειτουργικά* (Σταμπούλ: «ΝΟΥΡ», 1961). Basileios K. Nikolaides (1915–1985) was a canonarch of Iakōvos Nafpliotēs (Ἰάκωβος Ναυπλιώτης) and a student of Kōnstantinos Pringos (Κωνσταντῖνος Πρίγγος), was bestowed the ecclesiastical office of archon first chanter (ἄρχων πρωτοψάλτης) of the Great Church of Christ, and taught Byzantine music at the Theological School of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Halki from 1957–1985. For details of his biography, see Ὀλυμπία Τολίκα, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993), 252.

760. "Σοί, Κύριε."

761. "μὲ τὸ μάτι," in other words, "at a glance."

762. "Λάβετε, φάγετε..."

763. "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες..."

rection in "With fear of God...";[764] His Ascension at "Always, now and ever...";[765] and the like.

Nowadays, thanks to the widespread distribution and use of technical means, the hearing of texts that are read in a recitation style is possible, even if all the unfavorable conditions are encountered that earlier made the matter impossible. Long ago, microphones and speakers have also been introduced into our temples, which, if they are not abused, significantly facilitate the people's participation. However, for centuries, a tradition was already created with regard to the reading of the prayers inaudibly (μυστικῶς) and nowadays this is the generally prevalent taxis in the whole Orthodox Church. Even if it is proven theoretically that this practice has need of revision and correction, in practice it collides with, not only the fear of possible reactions, but also the impossibility of a general and pan-Orthodox addressing of the question so that the undesired split in the liturgical practice of the Orthodox churches is avoided. The serious and especially considerable objection is found there, and not in the flippant argument that the priests will have difficulty in the reading of the prayers. Even in periods of ignorance, liturgical deontology imposed on the celebrants to read the most difficult texts within earshot of the people (εἰς ἐπήκοον τοῦ λαοῦ), such as the prayers of the Great Hagiasmos and the kneeling of Pentecost, which are indeed said once during the year while the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos is celebrated daily and that of Basileios the Great quite often. Moreover, the education level not only of the people, but also of the sacred clergy, has noticeably been improved.

In any case, it is possible, applying a prudent approach, for many of the "side effects" (in some manner) of not reading the prayers within earshot of the people to be avoided and corrected. I am not just talking about the systematic liturgical catechesis and explanation of the prayers of the Divine Liturgy in sermons, homilies, and lectures and during the offering of catechesis in catechetical and other schools. This is indispensable and self-evident, whether the prayers are read inaudibly (μυστικῶς) or in earshot (εἰς ἐπήκοον).

764. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ..."
765. "Πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί..."

Similarly, very helpful is also the use of Enkolpia outside of the Liturgy and during it, with a translation or with only the text. There are so many different forms and publications of them, and they are already widely used in temples. As long as their use is transient so that the faithful can one day be freed of them, lest the space of the temple is changed into a reading room and Christians are isolated instead of being united at the time of divine worship. All of these are serious measures, but they are essentially half-measures, as long as the prayers continue to be said inaudibly (μυστικῶς). A serious step of improvement is for the prayers to be said in their place, namely (as we already said) prior to their exclamation. In the modern printed editions of the Hieratika, this step has already taken place, while in older ones there existed quite a few displacements. Let the prayers be read with due care and a regular rhythm, without the priest being occupied by speed; whether he is covered or not covered by the chanter. Many good celebrants implement this with success. They read the prayer in a lower tone (χαμηλότερο τόνο) and raise their voices a little when the chanter finishes, so as not for a hiatus to be created and for the words of the prayer to be heard. It goes without saying that the prayers cannot be omitted in any manner, nor for them to be said hurriedly, nor for them to be said during the epistle, the Symbol of Faith, the Lord's Prayer, or the koinōnikon. This impious disorder is destructive to the decent and orderly celebration of divine worship. Without impulsive and careless actions, prohibitions or encouragements, the tradition will gradually find its way. We are currently passing through a period of transitional situations and quests.

554

What is the connection and relationship between prayers and exclamations? Sometimes they leave the impression that the exclamations are not directly related to the content of the prayer which they conclude.

555

During the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, why is the "Our Father..."[766] said by the reader, but "For yours is..."[767] by the priest, while in other prayers both the prayer and the exclamation are said by the priest?

556

In both our Liturgies of the sacred Chrysostomos and Basileios the Great, why do we have the same exclamations, while the prayers are different?

It is well known that the Lord's Prayer was given by the Lord as a model of prayer, as an answer to the request of the disciples, "Lord, teach us to pray" (Luke 11:1). The Fathers who composed prayers were influenced by it, not only as to the content and the manner of the expression of our entreaties to God, but also as to the form. The Lord's "therefore pray in this way" (Matthew 6:9) was taken, in some manner, literally. The Lord's Prayer again follows Judaic compositional models for prayers, which we encounter even in books of the Old Testament. They begin, as also the Lord's Prayer, with an address to God, subsequently formulate the entreaties of the prayer and conclude with a doxology, which is directly related to the entreaties or to the last of them. The text of the Lord's Prayer, as it is rendered in a more succinct form by the evangelist Luke (chapter 11:2–4), does not conclude with a doxology. In its more extended form, which the evangelist Matthew preserves for us (chapter 6:9–13), the conclusion is doxological: "for yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory to the ages, amen." In this more extended form, it was used by the Church and is used up until nowadays, accompanied by the doxological conclusion, which was augmented and acquired the well-known trinitarian form, "...and the glory, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and to the ages of ages, amen." The commentating Fathers make the exclamation dependent on the seventh entreaty, "but deliver us from the evil one." Namely,

766. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..."
767. "Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν..."

the all-powerful God himself has the power ("kingdom...power... glory")[768] to save us from the snares and machinations of the evil one, the devil. In all the liturgical forms, apart from the Byzantine, at the recitation of the Lord's Prayer during the Divine Liturgy, between its end ("the evil one") and the doxological conclusion ("for yours is...") the so-called "embolism"[769] is inserted, an explanatory "gloss"[770] that links the seventh or even the sixth and seventh entreaties to the doxology. We quote the "embolism" from the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos: "And lead us not into a temptation [the sixth entreaty], O Lord, Lord of hosts, that we are unable to bear, the one who knows our weakness, but deliver us from the evil one [the seventh entreaty] and from his works and his every assault and cunning device, by your holy name [an allusion to the trinitarian doxology], which we invoke upon our humility; for yours is the kingdom...."[771] Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki gives an amazingly apt commentary, in which he precisely highlights the connection of the doxology to the last entreaty: "And who will abuse and afflict those who are governed (βασιλευομένους) by the Lord and God of all, the one who is master even of the angels [= "the kingdom," ἡ βασιλεία]? Or who will stand in opposition to your power? (Ἢ τίς τῇ δυνάμει σου ἀντιστήσεται) No one. Since you have created and preserve everything [= "and the power," καὶ ἡ δύναμις]. Or who will speak against your glory (Ἢ τίς πρὸς τὴν δόξαν σου ἀντερεῖ), or make an utterly insolent attack, or who contains the expanses?[772] For heaven and earth are full of it [= "and the glory," καὶ ἡ δόξα]" (*Dialogue*, 320).[773]

According to the model of the Lord's Prayer, Christian prayers conclude with a doxology, trinitarian most of the time, again according to the model of the liturgical elaboration of the doxology that concludes the "Our Father." Its connection with the prayer's

768. "βασιλεία... δύναμις... δόξα."
769. "ἐμβολισμός."
770. "γλῶσσα."
771. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 110.
772. Symeōn when using only the word, "τὰ πέρατα," is implying the phrase, "τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης" (the expanses of the ecumene) from Psalm 18:5.
773. PG 155:584a.

content is most of the time conspicuous when, obviously, the prayer has a single theme. For example, the prayer of the second antiphon of the Divine Liturgy seeks the protection of the people of God ("...save...protect...do not forsake...")[774] and its exclamation is similar to the exclamation of the Lord's Prayer for the same reasons, "For yours is the dominion...."[775] The prayer of the trisagion ("O Holy God, who is resting among the holy ones...")[776] constitutes an entreaty to the holy God for the reception of the chanting of the trisagion, and its exclamation summarizes it: "For you, our God, are holy...."[777] The prayer prior to the gospel reading requests the illumination of the hearers for the hearing of the sacred reading and concludes: "For you are the illumination...."[778] Prayers for curing of the sick, such as those of Unction and Hagiasmos, have analogous doxological conclusions: "For you are a God of mercy...,"[779] "For yours it is to show mercy and to save us...,"[780] and "For you are the source of healings...."[781] The funereal prayers, "For you are the Resurrection, life, and repose..."[782] and so forth. In other prayers, the connection of the exclamation with the prayer must be sought in its final phrase, such as in the sixth prayer of Matins ("...crush invisible and hostile enemies under their feet..."[783]–"For you are the king of peace..."[784]), the seventh of Matins ("...helper, mighty champion of our lives..."[785]–"May the might of your kingdom..."[786]), and the eighth prayer of Matins ("praising, singing, and blessing..."[787]–"For

774. "...σῶσον...φύλαξον...μὴ ἐγκαταλείπῃς..."
775. "Ὅτι σὸν τὸ κράτος..."
776. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος..."
777. "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."
778. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ φωτισμός..."
779. "Ὅτι Θεὸς ἐλέους..."
780. "Σὸν γάρ ἐστιν τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν ἡμᾶς..."
781. "Ὅτι σύ εἶ ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ἰαμάτων..."
782. "Ὅτι σύ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἡ ζωή, καὶ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις..."
783. "...σύντριψον ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀοράτους καὶ πολεμίους ἐχθροὺς..."
784. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης..."
785. "...βοηθὸς κραταιὸς ὑπερασπιστὴς τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν..."
786. "Εἴη τὸ κράτος τῆς βασιλείας σου..."
787. "αἰνοῦντας, ὑμνοῦντας, καὶ εὐλογοῦντας..."

blessed is your name..."[788]). For others, we must know their original liturgical framework in order for us to comprehend a prayer and an exclamation, such as the tenth prayer of Matins (an original prayer of the fiftieth psalm of the "asmatic" Typikon), which calls to mind the fiftieth psalm and appropriately ends in "By the mercy and compassion...,"[789] and the eleventh prayer of Matins (an original prayer of lauds),[790] which refers to this subject and closes with the doxology, "For all the powers of heaven praise you...."[791]

But when, especially in a later period, the prayers become more extensive and have varied content, their exclamations are not always able to be coordinated with the theme and are repeating stereotypical older doxological conclusions. The observation of the first question refers to this instance. The older the prayer and the more tested, so also the original invocation, the formulation of the entreaties, and the exclamation are found in conceptual unity and harmony. All are products of piety, venerable and sacred. However, they differ as to their philological and theological quality. Some are of high inspiration, texts often of unparalleled beauty and theological depths, others more mediocre works, without an absence completely of colloquial texts as well.

The exclamations, the doxological conclusions of the prayers, are said by the priest melodically[792] ("ἐκφωνητικῶς")[793] if the prayer is said by the priest, whether within earshot of the people or inaudibly. There are instances of exclamations that are also said inaudibly, such as for example the prayers of the Lamp-lighting and Matins, the Cherubic hymn, the prayer prior to the gospel reading, and so forth. Similarly, there exist in later practice instances of exclamations without prayers, such as for example "For to you are due all glory..."[794] and

788. "Ὅτι ηὐλόγηταί σου τὸ ὄνομα..."
789. "Ἐλέει καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς..."
790. "τῶν αἴνων" (of lauds).
791. "Ὅτι σέ αἰνοῦσι πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν..."
792. "μελωδικῶς."
793. As defined by Phountoulès in questions 551–553, "in a tone higher than the prayers and with a simple musical recitation," and, with regard to prayers, "μεγάλῃ" (in a loud)" or "λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ" (clear voice).
794. "Ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα..."

"For you are a merciful God who loves humankind..."[795] after the synaptes and ekteneis in various services, in imitation of the Divine Liturgy. There similarly exist instances where the prayer is said by the presider[796] or the reader together with its doxological conclusion, without this ending being said melodically.[797] Regarding an instance where the prayer is said by the people (namely, a presider or reader) and the priest says in an exclamatory manner the doxological conclusion I do not believe another exists, apart from that which is mentioned in the second question, namely, the "Our Father." This is something singular, regarding which the only possible explanation is the fact that the Lord's Prayer was recited simultaneously by the celebrants ("when the priest begins,"[798] according to the old rubric) and by the people, when again the prayer is said (also) by the priest. The insertion by the priest of the embolism can be considered another possible explanation, which is encountered as we said in all the other liturgical forms apart from the Byzantine. In other words, the embolism intervened after the common recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the exclamations were common, both that of the prayer and of the embolism. In this case, the common rule applied and did not present an irregularity.

Let it be noted that the melodic recitation of the end of the prayer by the priest, namely, of the exclamation, was an invitation for the people to answer "Amen" for the conclusion. As the sacred Augustine[799] says, to put their "signature" on the prayer, taking part in its entreaties (*Sermon 272*).[800] It can be compared, namely, to the conclusion that is done at the end of the troparia during chanting in order for the deacon or priest to insert the synaptē.

Saint Markos Eugenikos in his work, *Explanation of the Church's Daily Office,* gives a most beautiful explanation, "Concerning the exclamations of the priest." We quote it completely because it pertains

795. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος..."
796. See question 302 for the definition of "presider" (προεστώς)
797. "ἐκφωνητικῶς."
798. "ἀρχομένου τοῦ ἱερέως."
799. Phountoulēs put the name of Augustine in italics.
800. "Ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis," PL 38:1247. The mistaken citation of *Sermon 6* is corrected to 272 above.

to our subject and illumines it with its very delicate and theological elaborations into the practice and tradition of our Church:

"The exclamations of the priest both in the prayer handed down by God [he means the 'Our Father'] and in the others that he does by himself have this rationale. Just as in the case of other matters, on the one hand the doing of anything is an action of all and the one who desires it, but on the other hand, the expressing of the reason and cause for what has been done is an action of superiority and of knowledge. So also here, while the requesting from God of the things needed is our common action, for He says, 'Ask and it will be given to you,'[801] the justification of petitions is not said by us, either on account of our virtue and zeal, but rather because you are able to.[802] For, 'Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory.'[803] To proclaim 'For you are a good God who loves humankind...'[804] and others that sing praises concerning God, but sometimes also to give glory upon things with a clear voice, would be for the priest, 'the interpreter of divine justification,'[805] says Dionysios the one great in divine things.[806] Therefore, it is customary to perform the petitions in common with others or alone on behalf of others (those who are chanting), but for the ending matters he alone strikes them up with a loud voice while directing himself to God, to whom doubtless also the prayer is directed, teaching us the reasons by which we are about to be listened to on a foundation of humility and at the same time of certain hope. For if it is said that it was to be heard dependent

801. Matthew 7:7.

802. "δύνασαι." Namely, the justification of the petitions is granted by God.

803. "Σοῦ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα."

804. "Ὅτι ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος Θεός ὑπάρχεις..."

805. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, *Concerning Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 7.3.7 (PG 3:564a). Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite was a sixth century author who falsely represented his writings as those of the hieromartyr Saint Dionysios, who is mentioned in Acts 17:34 and commemorated on October 3. Pseudo-Dionysios's theological views were heavily influenced by Neoplatonism and exercised a wide influence on liturgical writings (Alexander Kazhdan and Barry Baldwin, "Dionysios the Areopagite, Pseudo-," *ODB* 2:629–630).

806. The title, "ὁ πολὺς τὰ θεῖα," is derived from Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, *Concerning the Divine Names* 2.11 (PG 3:649d).

on our worthiness, we would probably have perpetual doubts, even when we do good, being mutable and never remaining constant. But now, it is possible to have the benefit of what we asked for from the attributes of God that are eternal and immortal, and so it would not be right to be doubtful. Therefore, the priest's voice represents in some manner a divine response to those making requests and puts[807] certainty into the souls of those who understand, and at the same time, in some manner, he takes part in our own singing, during which he exclaims, and we in turn take part here in the prayers, while we submit our ears in silence to the one who exclaims, and we add 'Amen.'"[808]

The third question raises a very difficult liturgical problem, to which the answer is neither easy nor perhaps even possible, since liturgical manuscripts older than the eighth century do not exist. The *Codex Barberini 336*, the most ancient surviving Euchologion of the Byzantine liturgical form is dated at that time, at the end of this century. It already presents the two Liturgies of Basileios the Great and of the sacred Chrysostomos composed in their contemporary form. We know their development from the fourth up until the eighth century only indirectly and in a fragmented way from sporadic witnesses of Fathers and ecclesiastical writers.

Thus, as a result, in their complete configuration, both Liturgies are presented as having common diaconal petitions and common exclamations from beginning to end. They only differ as to the prayers in their original most ancient part, namely, from the prayer for the catechumens up until the end, where "Let us go forth in peace,"[809] is placed. The newer part (from "Blessed is the Kingdom..."[810] up until the exclamation, "For you are a merciful God who loves hu-

807. "ἐμβάλλει" is a word that has the same root as "ἐμβολισμός," the gloss that is inserted between the Lord's Prayer and its doxological exclamation.

808. Saint Markos Eugenikos, Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας *(Explanation of the Church's Daily Office)* (PG 160:1188d–1189b. The translation follows the PG text, which differs in punctuation from that reproduced in Phountoulēs.

809. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

810. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."

mankind..."[811] of the ektenēs and from the prayer behind the ambōn and following) is easily explained as to why it is the same since it was added in various phases afterwards. Similarly, the same thing also applies for the service of the proskomidē, the prothesis, as well as for "No one is worthy..."[812] and "Hearken O Lord...,"[813] which come from the Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios the Theologian of the Alexandrian liturgical form. The other nine prayers, which constitute the original text of the Liturgies and are parceled out into three groups of three (prayer for the catechumens, first prayer of the faithful, second prayer of the faithful — prayer of the proskomidē, prayer of the anaphora, prayer prior to the "Our Father" — prayer of inclination, prayer "after all partake,"[814] "prayer in the diakonikon in consuming the Holy Elements"[815]), while dissimilar in their text, have the same exclamations, with only one exception, the prayer "in the diakonikon," which does not have an exclamation because it was said by the priest privately. Even the intermediate exclamations inserted into the prayer of the anaphora ("Singing the triumphal hymn...,"[816] the words of institution of the mystery—the fact that they are introduced into the Liturgy of Basileios the Great with "He gave..."[817] is done simply in order for some point of differentiation to exist—"Your own of your own...,"[818] "Especially...,"[819] "Among the first...,"[820] "And grant to us...,"[821] and "And may the mercy..."[822]) are also identical in both Liturgies. What explanation could be given for this identicalness of the exclamations, even indeed of the diaconal petitions and of the common course in general of the two Liturgies as to ceremonial practices, the series of prayers,

811. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος..."
812. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."
813. "Πρόσχες Κύριε..."
814. "μετὰ τὸ πάντας μεταλαβεῖν."
815. "εὐχὴ ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ ἐν τῷ συστεῖλαι τὰ ἅγια."
816. "Τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντα..."
817. "Ἔδωκε..."
818. "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν..."
819. "Ἐξαιρέτως..."
820. "Ἐν πρώτοις..."
821. "Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν..."
822. "Καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐλέη..."

and the common standard rubrics? And for us to stay only on the exclamations. It is impossible for us to accept that both authors absolutely coincided in writing the exclamations of their prayers. Accordingly, the exclamations either are derived from a common pre-existing tradition or belong to one of the two Liturgies and was also used by the other's author. As to the first solution, one could consider as a source the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, although it differs from the Byzantine Liturgies both as to the number of prayers and as to the exclamations, which are clearly more developed in it. Have these been abridged in the Byzantine Liturgies or, conversely, have they been developed in the Liturgy of Iakōvos? It is an entirely philological problem. But here again it will be necessary for us to accept the intervention of someone, of Basileios the Great or of Chrysostomos, for the development of a new text. But either way, one of the two must have preceded. The fact that Chrysostomos is later does not mean anything because the Liturgy of Chrysostomos basically is the ancient Liturgy of Antioch, which is likely older than the Liturgy of Basileios the Great.

If we are attentive to the text of the prayers in correlation to the exclamations and accept in principle as a given (as it also is) that the prayers of our two Liturgies are most ancient and tried texts and that, accordingly, the exclamations must be consistent with the texts of the prayers, then we can trace some solutions. The first determination is that the exclamations of many prayers are better suited to the Liturgy of Chrysostomos than that of Basileios the Great. For example, the exclamation of the second prayer of the faithful, "That always guarded by your might...,"[823] does not harmonize as much with the entreaties of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, which refer only to the worthiness of the celebrants for the celebration of the mystery, as with the corresponding prayer of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, which concerns the priests and the people and mentions entreaties in general that only with the mighty protection of God can be realized. In the prayer of the holy anaphora, the exclamation that introduces the triumphal hymn ("Singing the triumphal hymn...), on the one

823. "Ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους σου πάντοτε φυλαττόμενοι..."

hand in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is immediately connected with what precedes, while in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great already at "they have cried aloud,"[824] there exists the whole following phrase of the exclamation ("singing, proclaiming, crying aloud, and saying"),[825] and even the same word ("they have cried aloud/κέκραγεν" — "crying aloud/κεκραγότα"). Likewise, in the same prayer, "Among the first, O Lord, remember our Archbishop..."[826] on the one hand, in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, is introduced after a number of entreaties, while in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos it is found immediately after the petition for the rulers, which is the correct and traditional place in the litany of peace, and anywhere else, for the commemoration of the archbishop. These things of course are only indications, but are sufficient in order to support, as I believe, the position that the common elements of our two Liturgies, at least as far as the exclamations, come from and better suit the Liturgy of Chrysostomos than the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. The texts of the two Liturgies are interchanged within a fixed schema of exclamations, diaconal petitions, and standard rubrics, just as it is done up until nowadays, according to the ancient Alexandrian taxis, also in the Coptic liturgical form with the three Liturgies of the Church of Egypt, namely, of Saint Markos, Basileios the Great, and Grēgorios the Theologian.

These also are a few points for the third question.

557

During the Divine Liturgy and the other services, when must the faithful stand and when can they be seated?

As we wrote in the answer to questions 547 and 548, during times of public worship, the posture of the faithful is prescribed by the Church's pertinent worship tradition and is expressed—but not always—by the deacon's commands, who acts as a master of ceremonies in the synaxes. In the absence of a deacon, these commands are

824. "κέκραγεν."
825. "ᾄδοντα, βοῶντα, κεκραγότα καὶ λέγοντα."
826. "Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν..."

given by the priest. Thus, we have "Arise,"[827] "Let us stand aright, let us stand with fear,"[828] "Bending the knees...,"[829] and "...raise us up...,"[830] in the Byzantine liturgical form. We also have the ones above or others similar in other liturgical forms, such as, "Let us bend the knee,"[831] "...raise us up...,"[832] "Let us arise,"[833] "Arise let us be standing before the Lord with fear and trembling to offer"[834] in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*; "Let us stand with fear of God and compunction"[835] in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos; "Those seated arise"[836] in the Liturgy of Saint Markos; and so forth. In order for the rising and the upright or kneeling posture to be requested, it is apparent that the faithful were seated before this command, or at least could be seated, and then had to rise. Since there do not exist special relevant rubrics that prescribe when Christians are seated, we infer the time for sitting and rising indirectly from the commands above. In the monastic brotherhoods, there exists a kind of unwritten Typikon, which prescribes when the fathers stand and when they are seated, when they descend from and when they ascend to their stasidia, when they deeply bow forward,[837] when they cover

827. "Ὀρθοί."

828. "Στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν μετά φόβου."

829. "Κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα..."

830. "...ἀνάστησον..."

831. "Κλίνωμεν γόνυ."

832. "ἀνάστησον ἡμᾶς."

833. "ἐγειρώμεθα."

834. "Ὀρθοὶ πρὸς Κύριον μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἑστῶτες ὠμεν προσφέρειν." *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12.2 in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, ed. and trans. Marcel Metzger, SC 336 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987), 176.

835. "στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ κατανύξεως," B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 82.

836. "Οἱ καθήμενοι ἀνάστητε." Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 50; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 35.

837. For example, at the moment of the great entrance of the Divine Liturgy, monks typically descend from their stasidia, take off their head coverings and place them on their shoulders, and, while still standing, bow without bending their knees almost at a ninety-degree angle. This similarly takes place in the moments prior to holy communion, normally before the chalice is presented. Here the term, stasidia (στασίδια), the plural of the word, "στασίδιον, τό," refers

themselves, and when they uncover themselves.[838] Thus, without being instructed or commanded from above, all conform themselves to the pertinent tradition and harmoniously incorporate themselves into the body of the worshipping community. In parishes, of course, things are not so ideal due to the congregation's lack of uniformity, the absence many times of liturgical catechesis and education, and even a reduced inclination towards piety. It is well known that at "Let us stand aright..." many are seated or at "Let us bow our heads to the Lord"[839] very few conform themselves to this exhortation. It is a matter of liturgical upbringing, which unfortunately is rare.

From the diaconal commands and from the sporadic indications that we encounter in the Typika, we can draw a sufficiently clear picture regarding the subject that occupies us. Similarly, there exist pertinent witnesses in the works of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, by which we are also again guided, albeit occasionally, in our knowledge of the practice that was followed in certain times and certain places. In the second book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, we have a thorough description of the liturgical synaxes as they took place in Antioch around the end of the fourth century. Mention constantly occurs regarding the fact that the faithful are seated in prescribed places of the temple for each rank and arise during the reading of the Gospel book, during prayers, and during the offering of the sacrifice: "Let the body of presbyters be seated,"[840] "Let the laity be seated in another place with all silence and good order, and let also the women themselves be separately seated, while observing silence,"[841] "and when the Gospel book is read, let the presbyters, deacons, and all the people stand with great silence,"[842] "let the youth be seated separately if there is room, but if not let them stand upright. Let the

to a seat in a monastic chapel or church. See below in this answer for their description.

838. When covering and uncovering, the monks take off and put on their hats (σκοῦφος) and cowls/hoods (ἐπανωκαλύμμαυχον or κουκούλιον, headdress worn as a sign of a tonsured monk).

839. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."

840. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.4 in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, ed. and trans. Marcel Metzger, SC 320 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985), 312.

841. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.4 (SC 320:312).

842. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.8 (SC 320:314).

ones already advanced in age be seated in rank. Let their mothers and fathers help the children who stand," "Let the virgins, widows, and senior widows stand or be seated before all,"[843] "and after this [the sermon] in unison all arising...let them pray to God,"[844] "after these things let the sacrifice take place, while all the people stand and pray silently."[845] Basically, the same tradition is continued up until nowadays. The faithful stand during the gospel reading and during the prayer of the anaphora from "Let us stand aright..." up until "And may the mercy of our Great God...,"[846] during the "I believe"[847] and the "Our Father"[848] up until the beginning of the koinōnikon and during communion ("With the fear of God...")[849] and following, up until the dismissal. This is precisely the taxis that is provided for by the *Apostolic Constitutions* and that survived up until nowadays. The only thing is that, at the time, the Symbol of Faith and the Lord's Prayer had not yet been introduced into the Divine Liturgy. The antiphons or the typika were also introduced later. And here again by analogy standing is required at "Blessed is the Kingdom...,"[850] during the entrance (the diaconal command, "Wisdom, arise,"[851] was originally said at the lower part of the temple[852]) up until also the trisagion, just as also during the entrance of the gifts (cheroubikon). "Arise having partaken..."[853] again constitutes an exhortation for an arising of the seated, given that holy communion lasted a long time, and after the divine partaking the communicants ("having partaken...")[854] retired and were possibly sitting, awaiting the thanksgiving after partaking.

---

843. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.12 (SC 320:314–316).
844. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.14 (SC 320:316).
845. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.57.21 (SC 320:321).
846. "Καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ..."
847. "Πιστεύω," namely, the creed.
848. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..."
849. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ..."
850. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."
851. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί."
852. Likely, in the front part of the temple towards the ambōn, which usually was almost in the center.
853. "Ὀρθοὶ μεταλαβόντες..."
854. "μεταλαβόντες..."

The practice does not appear to have been the same everywhere. We have witnesses that while at the epistle reading, they sat in some places, just as it is also customary nowadays, elsewhere they stood upright, just as can be indirectly inferred from the standard rubric, according to which, while at the readings of Vespers we are sitting when they are from the Old Testament, we stand when they are from the Catholic Epistles.[855]

In Matins, upright posture is provided for during the Six Psalms, during the gospel reading of Matins (if there is one), during the ode for the Theotokos ("More honorable")[856] or the ninth ode of the canons, and during the doxology. Formerly in an upright posture, they read or even chanted antiphonally the kathismata of the Psalter, namely, the psalms' three "staseis" of two "kathismata," which are usually recited with stichologia in Matins. But they sat at the troparia/kathismata, which are intercalated between the stichologiai, which are otherwise called "anapausima."[857] The old terms are clear. Confusion later occurred in the terms and practice. In old manuscripts of the Psalter, the word, "kathisma" (κάθισμα) always exists after the completion of the three "staseis," which were thus called because the psalms were chanted by the brothers upright ("standing"),[858] while the "kathismata"/troparia were chanted when the fathers were seated.[859] Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki succinctly comments on this practice: "Next sitting and singing in praise, and the former on account of a small rest for the flesh, and the latter because one must sing praise to God while both sitting and standing, at the time also when matters concerning the feast are read from the

855. Namely, the seven general epistles of the New Testament that are not directed towards specific congregations (James [Iakōvos], 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, and Jude).

856. "Τιμιωτέρα."

857. "ἀναπαύσιμα." This word can refer to repose, which in this context appears to imply a resting point and sitting posture for the congregation. See also question 531 for an additional discussion of this word.

858. "Ἱσταμένους."

859. Phountoulēs is emphasizing here the etymology of the Greek terms, namely that "stasis" (στάσις, ἡ) has the meaning of "standing" and "kathisma" (κάθισμα, τό) that of the "part on which one sits," (v. LSJ, "στάσις, ἡ" and "κάθισμα, τό").

saints for common teaching [he means the readings from patristic texts that were intercalated in between the kathismata and the odes]" (*Dialogue*, chapter 311).[860] Saint Markos Eugenikos is more detailed: "After this ["God is the Lord..."[861] or "Alleluia"], we read while taking up again part of the Psalter, separating also this with both doxologies and troparia that are called 'kathismasin' (καθίσμασιν), which we do sitting also reading from one side to the other, for the purpose of both profit and rest at the same time" (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*).[862]

Similarly, the faithful also stand upright during the second reading of the Vespers of Great Lent, the reading from Proverbs, which is considered a type[863] of the gospel reading since it refers to Wisdom, the Christ.

Now regarding when the faithful sit during the sacred services and during the Divine Liturgy, special diaconal exhortations or witnesses from the different sources do not exist. It is left to the discretion and to the capabilities of the individual believer, since both when seated and standing, according to Saint Symeōn, we can sing praises to God. We already saw from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but also know from other sources that they were seated during the sermon. From the diaconal exhortations for an upright posture, we gather that prior to them they could be seated, just as for example, before the entrances, before the gospel reading, before the beginning of the prayer of the holy anaphora, and before the prayer of thanksgiving after holy communion. But generally, there exists in our tradition, particularly among monks, a strong preference for the upright posture both for theological and ascetical reasons. It is considered a posture of the free children of God, an expression of boldness, of vigilance and living hope concerning the future goods, and a form and confession of the resurrection from the dead. Characteristic are

860. PG 155:569d–527a.

861. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."

862. PG 160:1177d. He is describing antiphonal reading. In contemporary monastic practice, antiphonal reading and chanting of the Psalter continues to be seen in practice.

863. The word "τὺπος" here is used in the sense of a representation or prefiguring of the Gospel reading.

the homilies of Basileios the Great, which not only chiefly refer to prayer during Sunday, but generally refer to the theological meaning of the upright posture during prayer: "We complete our prayers on the first day of the week upright, but we do not all know the reason. For on the day of the Resurrection, by the posture during prayer, not only as resurrected with Christ and obliged to seek things from above[864] do we remember the grace that has been given to us, but because it seems in a certain way an image of the age to come...It is therefore of necessity that the Church educates her pupils to complete their prayers on this day while standing, so that, by the continual reminder of the everlasting life, we do not neglect provisions for this departure...During this time, the laws of the Church teach us to prefer the upright position of prayer that by visible reminding, so to speak, we transfer our mind from the things of the present to those of the future. Through every kneeling and rising up, we show in action that by sin we fell to the earth and by our Creator's love for humankind we were called back to heaven" (*Concerning the Holy Spirit*, chapter 27).[865]

However, at the same time, the upright posture is also a way of asceticism and an imitation of the angels who stand at God's throne. Chiefly in ascetical books, the "all-night standings"[866] of many holy ascetics are mentioned, who prayed upright for endless hours, supported by "suspenders in secret"[867] or by crutches. For the synaxes, the worshipers invented stasidia, which, when properly constructed, such as for example on the Holy Mountain, are a marvel of knowledge of the human body's anatomy. They enable propping up the one praying when he stands upright, supporting him in a half-seated

---

864. Colossians 3:1.

865. Basileios the Great, *Concerning the Holy Spirit* 27.66 in *Basile de Césarée, Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. and trans. Benoît Pruche, SC 17 bis, 2nd edition (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968) 484–486.

866. "πάννυχοι στάσεις."

867. "ἐν κρυφῇ κρεμαστῆρας." This refers to the use of suspensions (sometimes in the form of chains) in certain monastic cells that even allow for sleeping in an upright position to deprive the body of comfort. Such practices were and are done "in secret" (ἐν κρυφῇ), and not generally prescribed, often unknown to the brotherhood until access to a cell after the falling asleep of the ascetic. Such practices are generally done with the blessing of a spiritual father.

posture, and relaxing him when he is seated.[868] As they occupy the semicircles of the choirs and the walls of the temples, they preserve the unity of the praying community and do not isolate the faithful, changing them into spectators of a sacred spectacle, just as took place with the proliferation of chairs in our temples during modern times, which do everything except facilitate the upright posture. These chairs are not a reminder, encouragement, and helpful means for the traditional upright posture of prayer, as are the stasidia.

Finally, the characterization of the well-known service of the Salutations of the Panagia as an "Akathist hymn" shows that during it by exception the faithful stood upright out of reverence for the most holy Theotokos and as an indication of thanksgiving to her. Therefore, they were seated during other similar services. Niképhoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos also confirms it in the synaxarion for the Saturday of the Fifth Week of the Fast: "It is called Akathistos,[869] because at that time, during that night, all the people sang the Hymn to the Mother of the Word in an upright position, and because while during all the other Oikoi[870] we are customarily seated, we all listen upright during the present ones of the Mother of God."

558

After the gospel reading or after the sermon, must the ektenês ("Let us all say...")[871] be said or is the exclamation, "That always guarded by your might..."[872] immediately said or is the synaptê, "Again and again..."[873] said and afterwards the exclamation "That always guarded by your might...," and are all the others inaudible or omitted?

The correct and ancient taxis, which is printed in the Euchologia and Hieratika nowadays in use, is for the following to be said: after

868. They are also designed to allow the worshipper when seated to rest his or her head on the arm rest.

869. "ἀκάθιστος" (without sitting).

870. "Οἴκοις." The capitalization of the word in the text is preserved in the translation.

871. "Εἰπωμεν πάντες..."

872. "Ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους σου πάντοτε φυλαττόμενοι..."

873. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι..."

the reading of the gospel pericope, or immediately after the sermon, the ektenēs with the exclamation "For you are a merciful...,"[874] the petitions for the catechumens with their exclamation "So that with us they also...,"[875] the small synaptē that introduces the first prayer of the faithful ("Again and again...") and its exclamation "For to you are due all glory...,"[876] and the second small synaptē that introduces the second prayer of the faithful and its exclamation ("That always guarded by your might..."). This taxis exists in all the manuscripts and the printed editions, and is maintained in the monasteries and in the Slavic churches mandatorily also up until nowadays. The same taxis was also applied in Greek parish churches from the outset up until nearly the beginnings of our century.[877] Those who managed to hear old-time priests, who had not graduated from ecclesiastical schools, academies, or universities, will remember that they always said the ektenēs and the two synaptes of the prayers of the faithful with their exclamations, and occasionally both the prayers and the exclamation of the prayer for the catechumens. However, at other times, they omitted the petitions for the catechumens. They learned this taxis from elder priests and from the monasteries. No one can exactly pinpoint the time, the cause, and much more, the introducer of this change, to which the question is referring. In any case, I believe, it must be connected with the transition from the self-taught clergyman to the one educated in ecclesiastical schools. At least this is how matters appear. The "change" took place and quietly became prevalent (or nearly became prevalent), but without yet stabilizing into a uniform practice. Thus, it is possible for one to hear all the variations that are mentioned in the question, and even others:[878]

874. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων..."

875. "Ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σὺν ἡμῖν..."

876. "Ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα..."

877. The twentieth century.

878. For scholarship dealing with the ektenēs, see Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine: Étude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971), 148–156; the recent translation and updating of the latter work, Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 237–244; Stefano Parenti, "L'*Ektenê* della Liturgia di Crisostomo nell' Eucologio St. Pe-

- The whole ektenēs, together with the petitions for the catechumens and the two synaptes and exclamations for the prayers of the faithful, just as in the monasteries and once in a while also in the parishes.
- The ektenēs abridged and all the subsequent elements.
- The ektenēs without the petitions for the catechumens and with the two synaptes and exclamations of the prayers of the faithful.
- The ektenēs, the synaptē, and the exclamation of the second prayer of the faithful.
- The synaptes and the exclamations of the two prayers of the faithful.
- The synaptē alone and the exclamation of the second prayer of the faithful.
- "That always guarded by your might..." alone, which tends to be (if it is not already) the more prevalent.[879]

Another variation also exists; some say the ektenēs and all the remaining elements. However, in order for the prayers for the catechumens to be modernized, which presuppose them being present, the diaconal petitions are omitted: "Catechumens, pray to the Lord,"[880] "Catechumens, bow your heads to the Lord,"[881] and "Those who are catechumens, depart."[882] I heard this latter variation in a monastery. This is true polymorphism, if not confusion, which was natural to happen once the ancient and Pan-Orthodox taxis was abolished, quite irresponsibly and superficially.

---

tersburg gr. 226 (X Secolo)," in *ΕΥΛΟΓΗΜΑ: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, S.J.*, ed. Ephrem Carr, Stefano Parenti, Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, Elena Velkovska, Studia Anselmaniana 110, Analecta Liturgica 17 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993), 295–318; Stefanos Alexopoulos, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of Its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Units*, Liturgia Condenda 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 197–202.

879. In the translation, for clarity, the paragraph is presented in a series of bullets.

880. "Εὔξασθε, οἱ κατηχούμενοι, τῷ Κυρίῳ."

881. "Οἱ κατηχούμενοι, τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνατε."

882. "Ὅσοι κατηχούμενοι, προέλθετε."

It would be certainly interesting for us to attempt to pinpoint and to evaluate the reasons that caused these changes in order for us to correctly take a position on our topic. One cause must be the celebration of the Divine Liturgy connected with Matins. This was done during the years of the Tourkokratia[883] to accommodate the faithful. Namely, for one synaxis to take place and not two, as it was originally. It is well known that Matins concludes with an ektenēs, just as it continues to be done during the weekdays when the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated, or even during Great Saturday (service of the epitaphios), as well as during the first days of Great Week. It was natural for two similar ekteneis in so brief a time span, now within a single service of Matins and Liturgy, in some manner, to "compete against each other." For a time, both remained. Afterwards, by a bad coincidence, as sometimes occurs in competitions, both "dropped." Moreover, for the new very lengthy service (Midnight Office–Matins–Hours–Divine Liturgy) to survive in the parishes and to remain within tolerable time limits, enough things had to be sacrificed, sometimes things very important and crucial to the structure of the services: omission of the kathismata of the Psalter; omission of the stichologia of the odes and the psalms of lauds; either the partial reading or the entire omission of the canons; omission or reading inaudibly of the ektenēs and the remaining elements of the end of Matins; omission of the services of the Hours; compression of the antiphons, the prokeimena and allēlouaria of the Divine Liturgy; and, finally, omission or reading inaudibly of the ektenēs of the catechumens and of the prayers of the faithful.

One other reason for the omission of the ektenēs was (and is) that the petitions for the catechumens are also included within this section of prayers (ektenēs—petitions for the catechumens—two prayers of the faithful). Catechumens, obviously unbaptized adults, did not exist. Moreover, the prayer for them presupposed (as we said) them present, inclining heads, praying, and departing. It appeared (as it also is) "anachronistic." The attempt for a "modernization" swept everything away. The well-known fact should be noted

883. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

that after the creation of the Hellenic state we went through a phase, so to speak, of "rationalism" or rather, to be lenient, of reflection and questionings. That for which Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki blames some of his contemporaries was on the daily agenda in our country, that not with a disposition for learning and out of genuine interest, but out of pride and contempt they said, "what is this and what is that" in divine worship (*Dialogue*, chapter 364).[884] For the same reason, the repetitions of "Again and again..."[885] appeared annoying, to the extent that these also obviously fell victims of the same tactic. Other reasons also perhaps contributed. Namely, the introduction of polyphonic chanting and the tendency for a more melodic recitation of the diaconal petitions, exclamations, the "leitourgika,"[886] and the responses of the people during the Divine Liturgy, and even a tendency for haste,[887] which possessed many. The omission of the ektenēs of the catechumens and the two synaptes resolved these demands and left time for a more leisurely performance of the hymns and for the sermon. It was a transitional period and let us face it with a relevant understanding. However, it did create a new tradition.

We wrote in an old answer regarding the topic of the omission of the diaconal petitions, and the prayer and exclamations for the catechumens (question 71). At the time, we may not have had adult

884. PG 155:677d.

885. "Ετι και ἔτι..."

886. "λειτουργικά." This term refers to a small collection of Byzantine chant music to cover the priest parts and responses after the Cherubic hymn up until "It is meet..." (Ἄξιόν ἐστιν), which varies on feasts; or the parts and responses themselves. Music is provided to cover the changes in tone, usually to match that of the Cherubic hymn. For an example, see Βασίλειος Κ. Νικολαΐδης, *Λειτουργικά* (Σταμπούλ: «ΝΟΥΡ», 1961). Basileios K. Nikolaides (1915–1985) was a canonarch of Iakōvos Nafpliotēs (Ἰάκωβος Ναυπλιώτης) and a student of Kōnstantinos Pringos (Κωνσταντῖνος Πρίγγος), was bestowed the ecclesiastical office of archon first chanter (ἄρχων πρωτοψάλτης) of the Great Church of Christ, and taught Byzantine music at the Theological School of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Halki from 1957–1985. For details of his biography, see Ὀλυμπία Τολίκα, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993), 252.

887. Examples of such "haste" have not gone unnoticed in Greek society, where the faithful have even developed a special colloquial term, "παπατρέχας," to signify a "priest who runs fast," namely, one who races through readings, prayers, and petitions.

catechumens. Now we do, and indeed many.[888] We will not repeat what we wrote at the time.

As for the ektenēs, its omission can be characterized, without exaggeration, as a true "misfortune."[889] Not only from the point of view of structure is it a real creation of wonderful beauty ("Let us all say with all our soul and with all our mind, let us say,"[890] "O Lord pantokrator, God of our fathers, we pray you, hear us and have mercy,"[891] "Have mercy on us, O God, according to your great mercy, we pray you, hear us and have mercy,"[892] "Again we pray...,"[893] "Again we pray...," and so forth, "For you are a merciful..."[894]), but also, due to its flexibility, it presents wonderful possibilities for the addition of entreaties and names of the living, deceased, sick, donors, newlyweds, and so forth. Instead of anti-traditionally adding to the litany of peace entreaties for "those who ride, fly, flee for refuge, care for the aged"[895] and similar things, and instead of enumerating after the summary for all, "May the Lord God remember all of you in his kingdom,"[896] whole series of situations and names during the great entrance, all these elements could find a place in the entreaties of the ektenēs. And on the one hand in a good manner and out of good intent the entreaties are modernized,[897] but a place is wrongly sought out for them in the great synaptē and in the commemoration of the

888. Phountoulēs is probably referring to the waves of immigration from the former communist countries of Eastern Europe after the fall of the Soviet Union, especially from among the Greek-speaking populations in the region of Northern Epiros within Albania, which included many unbaptized adults who were subsequently baptized in Greece.

889. "δυστύχημα."

890. "Εἴπωμεν πάντες ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν εἴπωμεν."

891. "Κύριε παντοκράτορ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, δεόμεθά σου, ἐπάκουσον καὶ ἐλέησον."

892. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου, δεόμεθά σου, ἐπάκουσον καὶ ἐλέησον."

893. "Ἔτι δεόμεθα..."

894. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων..."

895. "ἐποχουμένων, ἱπταμένων, προσφύγων, γηροκομουμένων."

896. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ."

897. For example, praying for those who are travelling by aircraft.

great entrance. All these things are consequences and "side-effects" of the omission of the ektenēs.

The same things also apply by analogy to the diaconal petitions for the two prayers of the faithful. The repetition is not, as it is badly thought, annoying, when it is done in the correct traditional manner, with a rapid pace, as it is said on the Holy Mountain. Divine worship has been structured by the Fathers with knowledge of the psychology of the people and in order for many to comfortably and pleasantly participate in it. Repetition in moderation relaxes and gathers the attention of people. Density and variety tire and distract them.

The omission of the ektenēs and all the elements that accompany it also had other consequences. If it is omitted, it is wrongly omitted. It is an inadmissible meddling in the sacred liturgical text, an improper action. If it is said inaudibly, it reaches the boundaries of the irrational. Prayers that are addressed to God are inaudibly said. The diaconal petitions are addressed to the praying community. Namely, for whom is it said, "Let us all say...," "Again we pray...," "Let us, the faithful, pray for the catechumens...,"[898] "Catechumens, bow your heads to the Lord...," "Depart...," and "Again and again"? For God? When are they said? During the trisagion? During the reading of the epistle? How is it possible to cover so many diaconal petitions, four prayers, the prayer prior to the gospel, and the incensing, by the reading of a single epistle pericope,[899] no matter how lengthy one might suppose it is? And additionally. Is the reading of the epistle not also done for the priest and is he not obliged to listen to the apostolic words also himself and indeed also provide a good example to the Christians? Not to mention also what meaning the exclamation "That always guarded by your might..." has, and what meaningful function it can have with the gospel reading or with the sermon. For this reason, we wrote above that the omission

898. "Οἱ πιστοὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων δεηθῶμεν..."

899. This recalls the reduction of the two epistle readings to only one. Concerning double epistle and gospel readings, see especially questions 421, 431, 432, and 433.

of the ektenēs constitutes a "misfortune," a frivolous initiative that approaches the boundaries of impiety.

559

During the commemoration of Saint James (Iakōvos) the Brother of the Lord (October 23) would it not be more preferable for a pericope to be read from the Catholic Epistle of James (Iakōvos) instead of the epistle, Galatians 1:11–19, being read?

In the answer to question 449, we wrote in detail regarding the subject of the pericopes of the epistle and gospel, which are read during the Divine Liturgy. The above epistle pericope (Galatians 1:11–19) is read during the commemoration of the apostle Iakōvos because in verse 19 the apostle Paul writes that he did not see during his ascent to Jerusalem another apostle other than "James (Iakōvos) the brother of the Lord" alone. The selection was done according to the criteria that we saw at the time, according to which in commemorations of persons that are mentioned in the New Testament even only the mention of their name sufficed for that pericope to be chosen. And if James (Iakōvos) did not have his own text in the canon of the New Testament, his Catholic Epistle, one would say that the choice of the pericope above constituted a tolerable contingency solution. However, when there exists in the canon this brilliant sacred text, the Catholic Epistle of James (Iakōvos), then there does not exist a way for anyone to find an acceptable justification. And this is the case indeed, since precisely in the parallel commemoration for the apostle Jude the Brother of God (τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου) (June 19), his Catholic Epistle is prescribed as an epistle reading.

Generally, just as we saw in that answer, and in the sequential reading of the Holy Scripture and in the Mēnologion, there exists a strong, nearly exclusive, preference for the epistles of the apostle Paul. In the sequential reading, the Catholic Epistles are all placed during weekdays, while on Saturdays and Sundays, even of periods where the Catholic Epistles are read, the pericopes of Paul's epistles are preferred. In the Mēnologion, the same epistles of Paul are repeated, indeed ad nauseam, and only in eight instances do pericopes

from the Catholic Epistles take their place, two times of which are specifically from the epistle of James (Iakōvos) (of the prophet Elissaios, June 14, and the prophet Elias the Thesbite, June 20, in fact, the same pericope: James (Iakōvos) 5:10–20). Pericopes are taken from the Acts of the Apostles an additional fourteen times.

In a possible future reexamination of the system of pericopes, which is on the program of the future Holy and Great Council to be assembled, a way must certainly be found for the spiritual richness of the Catholic Epistles to be used advantageously by their being put forward in the readings of Sundays and important feasts of the Mēnologion.[900] Their reading on weekdays or on a few small feasts or during the Vespers of the apostolic feasts essentially results in their marginalization from the series of readings and from the sermon.[901] But this is a broader subject and difficult to remedy. However, the blatant case of the commemoration of Saint James (Iakōvos) the Brother of the Lord does not have need of a decision of an ecumenical council in order to be remedied. The epistle is divided into eight pericopes, of which seven are read from the Wednesday of the Thirty-First Week up until the Thursday of the Thirty-Second (apart from Saturday and the Thirty-First Sunday) and the eighth is read as a first epistle in the service of unction. The topic can be quietly settled by a decision of a local church[902] and one of the pericopes above of the Catholic Epistle of James (Iakōvos) can be chosen on the day of his commemoration, especially when the Jerusalemite Liturgy bearing his name is celebrated, and the pertinent teaching is done in connection with it. This small adjustment in the readings does not ravage the liturgical unity of the Church.

900. This reexamination did not take place at the 2016 Holy and Great Council.

901. The word "and" appears to be missing in the text.

902. "Local church" here means an autocephalous church, such as the Church of Greece (Ἐκκλησία τῆς Ἑλλάδος), whose Sacred Synod could make such a decision.

560

The feasts of the Nativity and Theophany are connected with many ceremonial problems, which trouble the priests and people, and various answers and solutions are given by others. Would it not be worthwhile for these questions to be addressed in a consolidated way so that they are treated in a uniform manner?

Indeed, both these great feasts of the Lord present many ceremonial problems. If we only judge by the questions, which at times have been submitted by many and addressed by this column, a large part of them chiefly refer to the services for the eves of these feasts, as well as to their brilliant conclusion, the service of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany. The fact alone these concerns exist is also a comforting example of vitality and interest. As such they must be welcomed and resolved, as far as this is possible. With this in mind, with great effort and diligent research into the sources and into the Church's ceremonial tradition, we studied as thoroughly as possible many of the individual issues on the basis of the questions that at times had been submitted. For some of these questions, answers were given, to which one perhaps would not have added anything further or more substantial. It is pointless and tedious for us to constantly return to the same topics, without having something new to contribute. But for the love of the fathers and brothers who continue to submit relevant questions, either because they did not pay attention to the previous answers or because they were not satisfied by them, we return to these questions, summarizing what we extensively wrote there, referring to them for the details and for the strengthening from the sources of what things are written now, and attempting to see things from another viewpoint in order not to repeat what has been already said.

1. It is well known that the five last days of the forefeast for the Nativity (December 20–24) and the four forefeast days for the feast of Theophany (January 2–5) constitute a kind of "Great Week" for these two great feasts of the Lord. The imitation of the Great Week of Pascha consists in the "translation" or adaptation of the

two canons, the three triôdia and the diôdion of Great Week,[903] to the themes of the Nativity and Theophany, as well as in the Great Hours and in the Vespers of the eve with the many Old Testament readings and the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. More ancient than all these elements is Vespers, which, nearly in its present form, is already encountered in the Typikon of Saint Sophia from the ninth century (*Codices Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40*).[904] Its structure is parallel to the Vespers of Great Saturday and is obviously influenced by it, and the many Old Testament readings (eight for Nativity, thirteen for Theophany versus fifteen for Great Saturday) were intended originally for coverage of the time that the baptism of catechumens required, which took place in the baptistery at this hour. The Liturgy of Basileios the Great, which also follows in three instances (Nativity, Theophany, Great Saturday) is the great Liturgy of the vigil, the real climax of the feast. However, the celebration of Vesperal Liturgy, which ended after the second hour of the night, namely, at 9:00 PM, and the communion during it presupposed complete fasting from supper or from midnight of the previous day. For Great Saturday, there did not exist a problem because it is the only Saturday on which fasting takes place. However, it often happens that the eve of the Nativity and Theophany is not a fasting day, namely, it coincides with Saturday or Sunday, days for relaxation of fasting. For this reason, a Vesperal Liturgy cannot be celebrated on these days, because it was inconceivable for Christians to stay hungry on a day of joy, such as Sunday and by extension also Saturday. In these cases, during the morning, the customary Liturgy was celebrated, and during the evening, the service of Vespers for the feast was performed with the many readings, but without the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great. The Vespers was interrupted after the ektenēs, where it proceeded to the gospel reading.

The same taxis is in force nowadays, only that a Litē and aposticha are added in these instances to Vespers. In addition, nowadays,

903. During Great Week, there are three odes (triôdia) chanted three times for Matins during Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and two odes (diôdion) for Great Tuesday Matins.

904. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 1:176–185.

on the main day of the feast when it occurs on Sunday or Monday, instead of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated, which was not celebrated during the vigil of the feast. The old rubrics do not mention this, perhaps because it was self-evident during this period. The Liturgy of Basileios the Great was the Liturgy of Sundays and of feasts of the Lord, but its celebration in the cases above on the day of the feast of the Nativity and Theophany is obviously owed to survival of this old taxis.

A second and relatively later element of the forefeast days is the "Great Week," in some manner, of the Nativity and Theophany, which consists, as we said, in the use during these days of the forefeast canons, triōdia and diōdion, according to the adaptation of the respective hymnography of Great Week and Pascha, as well as the Great Hours of Great Friday. Symeōn Metaphrastēs (tenth century) is a composer, or rather an adapter, of these hymns.[905] The embellishment of these two great feasts of the Lord in imitation of Pascha was his obvious aim. However, the forefeast week of the Nativity is shortened to five days and that of Theophany to four. In both cases, the eves of the two feasts serve as Great Friday and Great Saturday at the same time.

The forefeast canons and the Great Hours of the Nativity and Theophany are encountered for a first time in the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (*Codex National Library of Athens 788* of the twelfth century), but not precisely as in modern Typika.[906] The Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior of Messina from the year 1311 is found to be closer to the present taxis.[907] Namely, while in the

905. Symeōn Metaphrastēs (Συμεών ὁ Μεταφράστης), a saint celebrated on November 28, lived during the second half of the tenth century and was known for his composition of a Mēnologion in ten volumes that contains 146 lives of the saints organized according to the church calendar. For additional information, see Fr. Halkin, "Συμεών. Ὁ Μεταφράστης," *ΘΗΕ* 11:536 and Alexander Kazhdan and Nancy Paterson Ševčenko, "Symeon Metaphrastes," *ODB* 3:1983–1984.

906. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 318–329, 398–411.

907. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA

Typikon of the Evergetis it has forefeast triōdia and so forth only in the feast of Nativity, the Typikon of Messina also has the triōdia and so forth of the forefeast of Theophany. However, the most important difference is found elsewhere.

The Great Hours of the Nativity and Theophany have been composed in imitation of the Great Hours of Great Friday, a day of strict fasting as well as aliturgic.[908] The Great Hours of the Nativity and Theophany are celebrated on the eves of these feasts, which are days of fasting. The Divine Liturgy is celebrated during the evening in imitation of Great Saturday, combined with Vespers, as we saw. However, what if the eve happens not to be a fasting day, namely, Saturday or Sunday? Then, according to the Typikon of the Evergetis, the Great Hours were suspended, namely, they were not celebrated at all, but the twelve idiomela of the Great Hours were distributed in the stichēra and in the aposticha of the Vespers and Matins of the eve. The Typikon of Messina preferred another solution, which finally became prevalent, namely, for the chanting of the Great Hours to be transferred to the nearest Friday, a fasting day prior to the Nativity, but not a fasting one prior to the feast of Lights. Perhaps this solution was the better one or, in any case, the more conservative one. However, as was natural, it created quite a few problems, which chiefly concerned the extent to which Great Friday's influence reaches. Namely, whether the Friday prior to the feast of Lights will be fasting and whether a Liturgy will be celebrated during these two days.

We dealt with this double issue earlier.[909] For the first, there exists a pertinent opinion of Saint Markos Eugenikos in the Mēnaion on January 6: We do not fast on the Friday, since it belongs to the festal twelve-day period, but during the eve consumption of wine and oil takes place, even if it is Saturday or Sunday. However, why is the Divine Liturgy not celebrated, as these two days are not included among the number of aliturgic days of the year (Great Friday,

185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 77–83, 93–101.

908. Namely, a day that the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated.

909. See the discussions in questions 157, 220, and 221.

Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare)? Is it for the service of the Great Hours to be done with greater convenience, or for the theme of the feast of the Lord to remain, in some manner, as an only theme of these days, or for the service of the day not to be weighed down? All these three arguments are very weak. And for the Friday prior to the feast of Lights, there is no real problem that arises from the non-celebration of the Divine Liturgy on this day. However, for the Friday prior to the Nativity there is a problem, especially indeed strong in the parishes due to attendance at holy communion, particularly of school children, and due to the feast of Saint Anastasia in temples celebrating, but also in temples not celebrating.[910] Is it such

910. This appears to refer to the practice in Greece for the attendance at services by an entire school body during certain times of the year, especially during the morning for the Divine Liturgy. Such "field trips" or special events are often coordinated with clergy, who otherwise may not have celebrated a service on that day. "Temples celebrating" refers to those that are dedicated to Saint Anastasia. Those "not celebrating" refers to parishes where, although not bearing the name, the Saint is popular (particularly in Greece where many are commonly named after this Saint). In both cases, a Liturgy would be celebrated when commemorating the Saint on her feast day, December 22. This would be problematic if it coincides on a day regarded as aliturgic, such as a Friday. See question 157, where Phountoulēs states:

> Moreover, two practical reasons would speak in favor for the performance of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos on the eves of the Nativity. The first is the commemoration of Saint Anastasia the One who cures wounds (December 22), who is especially honored in many places and the faithful assemble for her commemoration in temples and indeed in those temples dedicated in her name. The second reason is communion of the faithful, and indeed of the children, who approach en masse on the eves of the Nativity for holy communion. And the second can be addressed if as many of the Christians who do not know are notified in a timely manner that the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated on these days. However, the first reason is much more difficult. A commemoration of a saint on his/her feast day without the Divine Liturgy—since indeed his/her commemoration is not transferred, but his/her troparia are chanted at Vespers and Matins—would be inconceivable. I know cases where the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is celebrated on these days by many priests in temples celebrating their feast days or for the communion of the faithful, on the basis of an old tradition and despite the prohibition of the Typikon. In that case, the Liturgy ought to take place normally after the Sixth Hour, just as it should take place on the other days of the year, or after the Ninth Hour, as modern Typika provide for the feast of

a strong reason that imitation of Great Friday even reaches the point of not celebrating the Divine Liturgy? In any case, the old rubrics leave the impression that when saying "Liturgy is not celebrated,"[911] they mean not the Liturgy of Chrysostomos but the Liturgy of Basileios the Great combined with Vespers, which indeed, as we saw, is not celebrated, since in these cases the Friday prior to the Nativity or that prior to Theophany is not the eve of these feasts, but the proparamonē[912] or the day prior to the eve. According to the rubrics in force nowadays, the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated, not even that of the sacred Chrysostomos.

2. The problems that are connected with the service of the Great Hagiasmos are not as complicated as those of the forefeast days for the Nativity and Theophany. One part of them also again concerns and depends on whether the eve of Theophany is a day of fasting or not. The question is so raised in the ancient sources and not on whether the feast of Lights (as well as the Nativity in the preceding instance) coincides with Sunday or Monday. The outcome is the same but when pinpointing the ceremonial problem on whether the eve is a fasting or non-fasting day, we are immediately oriented to the cause of the issue and its solution.

Therefore, if the eve is a fasting day (consequently, Theophany does not coincide with Sunday or Monday), the service is normally conducted, and the Great Hours and Vespers with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great are done on the eve. The Great Hagiasmos is then done, according to the very clear standard rubric, immediately after "the prayer behind the ambōn." Thus, the Mēnaion in use records and adds after the conclusion of the Hagiasmos: "While entering the temple, we chant the present idiomelon in plagal of the second

---

Annunciation when it coincides with Great Friday. However, I think it would be preferable for it to be performed before the Hours, joined with Matins and, after the communion of the multitudes is concluded, afterwards the Great Hours are performed with fitting order and majesty, as the most ancient Typika provide in the instance above for the coinciding of Great Friday and the Annunciation.

911. "λειτουργία οὐ τελεῖται."

912. "προπαραμονή." The eve of the eve, namely, the day prior to the eve.

tone, 'Let us the faithful praise'[913]...Next the psalm, 'I will bless the Lord,'[914] and the kataklaston[915] is given, and a complete dismissal is done." The rubrics of the ancient Typika are also equally clear: "But at the dismissal, the deacon does not dismiss the people, namely, he does not say 'Let us go forth in peace,'[916] but 'Wisdom'[917] and the patriarch enters...and...the patriarch says the prayer of the waters" (Typikon of Saint Sophia).[918] "When the holy elements have been placed in the diakonikon, after returning the deacon says, 'Arise, Having partaken.'[919] Then, after the priest exclaims, 'For you are our sanctification'[920] and the people respond 'Amen,' the chanters begin the troparion in the plagal of the fourth tone, 'The voice of the Lord upon the waters...'[921] [the Great Hagiasmos is concluded and the Divine Liturgy continues:] The deacon, 'Let us pray to the Lord.'[922] The priest, the prayer behind the ambōn..." (Typikon of the Savior of Messina).[923] "And after the priest says the prayer behind the ambōn, neither the blessing being given, nor the usual psalm, 'I will bless the Lord,' being said, all go to the baptistery while chanting the present troparion, 'The voice of the Lord upon the waters' [the celebration of the Hagiasmos follows, and it continues:] All being sanctified also receiving from the partaking and sprinkling of the Hagiasmos...we enter the temple...immediately the blessing is given, while we say Psalm 33, 'I will bless the Lord'" (Typikon of the Evergetis).[924]

---

913. "Ἀνυμνήσωμεν πιστοί."

914. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον."

915. "τὸ κατακλαστόν," namely, antidōron, but normally the portion used by the priest to excise the particles for the living and those fallen asleep.

916. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

917. "Ὀρθοί."

918. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 1:182–183.

919. "Ὀρθοί· μεταλαβόντες."

920. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ἡμῶν."

921. "Φωνὴ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων..."

922. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

923. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes,* OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 98–100.

924. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February,* Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 414–419.

Apart from the standard rubric of the Mēnaion, we cited the witnesses of three ancient Typika (Great Church, Savior of Messina, and Evergetis). These rubrics could be multiplied by also referring to other old and modern Typika. All agree on the fact that the Great Hagiasmos is done within the Divine Liturgy, being inserted between its conclusion and prior to its complete dismissal. For this reason, also, the service of the Great Hagiasmos does not have, and never had, its own enarxis and dismissal. The disagreement between the standard rubrics that we cited, which is also encountered in other standard rubrics (on which we considered pointless to expand upon) is apparent. It consists in the fact that in the Typikon of Saint Sophia and that of the Savior of Messina, the dismissal phrase, "Let us go forth in peace," still maintained its original dismissal character and the prayer behind the ambōn was still saved in memory as a quasi-annex of the Divine Liturgy. The Great Hagiasmos was inserted between the exclamation, "For you are our sanctification," and "Let us go forth in peace," or, according to the modern taxis, between the prayer behind the ambōn and "Blessed be the name of the Lord...."[925] This is in force up until nowadays. "Blessed be the name of the Lord..." is a synopsis or propsalma of two psalms (33 and 144), which covered the distribution of the antidōron. The insistence on the strictness of the standard rubrics is not scholasticism[926] or, as it is said in a frivolous manner, formalism, but an expression of substance and liturgical deontology. It means here that after holy communion the drinking of the Great Hagiasmos is next and the partaking of antidōron follows. In the Small Hagiasmos of the first days of the months, and so forth, we have a reverse order: communion– antidōron–Hagiasmos.[927] Regarding the anteriority of the Great Hagiasmos ahead of the antidōron, we have besides also a response of Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios to Durad the despot of Serbia that "the Hagiasma of Holy Theophany is received prior

925. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..."
926. "σχολαστικισμός."
927. This is the order followed on Mount Athos.

to the antidōron."[928] Nevertheless, out of ignorance or negligence, these apparently insignificant standard rubrics are overlooked and the Great Hagiasmos is celebrated after "Blessed be the name" and sometimes after the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy.

These are the points regarding the normal celebration of the Great Hagiasmos on the eve of Theophany when it is a fasting day. When the eve is not a fasting day, namely, when it coincides with Saturday or Sunday, then the Great Hagiasmos is celebrated according to the old taxis either during the Vespers of the eve immediately after its gospel reading without the Vesperal Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great (Typikon of Evergetis) or during the morning of the main day at the end of the service of Matins (Typikon of Saint Sophia and that of the Savior of Messina). The Mēnaia also provide for this. According to the most modern taxis, which is observed in our country,[929] the Hagiasmos is celebrated after the end of the Divine Liturgy of the day before as well as after that of the main day of the feast, and the rubrics of the Typikon are put into practice that relate to the celebration of the Hagiasmos during the eve on a fasting day, namely, between the prayer behind the ambōn and "Blessed be the name of the Lord...."

---

928. Louis Petit, X.A. Sideridès, and Martin Jugie, eds., *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios* (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1935), 4:207. Gennadios II Scholarios (Γεννάδιος ὁ Σχολάριος), patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1454–1456, 1463, 1464–1465), a unionist at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, later became an opponent of union with the Roman Catholics and was the first patriarch after the fall of the Constantinople to the Ottomans (1453). He is known for the incorporation of Thomism into his theological thought. The response of Gennadios was part of a series of answers given to questions of Đurađ Branković (Ђурађ Бранковић), despot of Serbia (r. 1437–1456). There is a considerable bibliography on Gennadios, but basic information can be found in C.J.G. Turner, "The career of Georgios–Gennadios Scholarios," *Byzantion* 39 (1969): 420–55 and, regarding his Thomism, Matthew C. Briel, *A Greek Thomist: Providence in Gennadios Scholarios* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2020). For a recent study of the responses, see Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou, "Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch: New Evidence on Gennadios Scholarios' Responses to the Questions of George Branković," *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 9 (2012): 95–116.

929. Greece.

The custom for the Great Hagiasmos to be celebrated two times, on the eve of Theophany and the morning of the feast, caused many "problems," or rather pseudo-problems. And yet, despite the objections that existed in the beginning, this was rightly done and became prevalent at least in our region[930] because it proved helpful for the practical needs of Christians. However, in the attempt to justify the double celebration and the "difference" of the one from the other celebration, unheard-of and thoughtless things were said, and unfortunately are still said. Thus, while this is a case of precisely the same sanctification, basically the sanctification of the water of holy baptism, with precisely the same prayers and the entire celebration, the first of the eve is called "small" and that of the day of the feast "great." A problem was brought about as to which one of the two is drunk and which is sprinkled, as to which one is reserved and which is not reserved, regarding which one the drinking requires fasting and regarding which does not, and as to which one is celebrated in commemoration of Christ's baptism and as to which one in commemoration of John's baptism. For all these points, the answer is found within the text of the prayers, the diaconal petitions, and the standard rubrics, which speak regarding drinking and sprinkling, regarding sanctification of houses and every useful benefit, as well as regarding the keeping of sanctified water by the faithful drawing it ("may have it").[931] The double performance of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany can be compared as well to the modern practice for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy two times on the Sundays and the formal feasts where pastoral needs require it.[932] Similarly, it can be related to the practice that often prevails in parish temples, when perchance a vigil is performed in them, for a second Liturgy to be

930. Greece.

931. The phrase, "ἔχοιεν αὐτό," is taken from the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos, "Μέγας εἶ Κύριε..." (Great are you, O Lord...): "Ἵνα πάντες οἱ ἀρυόμενοι καὶ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἔχοιεν αὐτὸ πρὸς καθαρισμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων..." (That all who draw from and partake of it may have it for a purification of souls and bodies...).

932. Because there is a prohibition on celebrating the Divine Liturgy twice on the same altar and by the same priest, often contrivances are made to circumvent this, such as the use of a portable second altar with a different antimension and priest, but in the same temple.

celebrated on the day of their feasts to service the faithful who are not able to participate in the service and in the vigil's Divine Liturgy. Just as in these instances it would be inconceivable for some difference to be sought between the two Liturgies, the same thing also for the celebration two times of the Great Hagiasmos. But what, out of a broad spirit and out of an understanding of pastoral needs and a facilitation of Christians, was once rightly devised for the Hagiasmos of Theophany, is in danger of being strangled within an unbearable fastidiousness,[933] which is not pardoned by the otherwise laudable reverence for the so-called (and indeed it is) Great Hagiasmos.

It is customarily said that fasting on the eve of Theophany concerns the drinking of the Great Hagiasmos and therefore that the condition for the partaking of it is fasting for one day. It would be appropriate for a few words to be said regarding this subject because it is one of the most debated subjects of those connected with the Hagiasmos of Theophany and regarding which the faithful seek the counsel of priests.

No one can doubt the fact that the Great Hagiasmos "stands in the second place of the divine mysteries" (Euchologion, *Codex Vatopediou 134 [745]* from the year 1538), namely, it is the second most sacred "sacramental species" (according to scholastic terminology) after holy communion. It is the "water of regeneration" of holy baptism, which by the invocation and visitation of the Holy Spirit "is transformed" (ἀναστοιχειοῦται or μεταστοιχειοῦται), according to Kyrillos of Alexandria (*On John* 2.1),[934] and becomes "a source of incorruption, a gift of sanctification, a remission of sins, a protection against disease, "[935] for the faithful who partake of or are anointed by it, a provider of sanctification and blessing to all creation. The

933. Phountoulēs is using the word, "σχολαστικότητα," which sounds similar to "scholasticism" (σχολαστικισμός), but means, "fastidiousness, fussiness, pedantry."

934. PG 73:245a. Kyrillos of Alexandria (378–444, patriarch of Alexandria, r. 412–44) was particularly important for his role and influence during and after the Christological controversies of his period, including participation in the Ecumenical Council of Ephesos (431) and the composition of theological works.

935. Taken from the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos "Great are you, O Lord..." Μέγας εἶ Κύριε...") and adapted from the translation of Mother Mary

fact that the water of the Great Hagiasmos is the same as the water of holy baptism is evident also from the similarity of the consecratory prayers both from the old and the contemporary practice of the Church, which baptized and baptizes the catechumens in it, and from what Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki writes, who indeed reciprocally considers the water of baptism, "nothing less than that of Holy Theophany" (*Dialogue*, chapter 70).[936] As such, it is given instead of holy communion to the faithful who for some reason are prevented from approaching the latter. This precisely caused two pious misunderstandings: namely, that it replaces holy communion, as equal to it in some manner, and that by analogy fasting precedes its drinking. The first ought not to even be discussed because while it is clear that the Great Hagiasmos is the most sacred species after holy communion for the reasons that we stated, in no way is it a communion of the Lord's Body and Blood, nor ever replaces it. Nevertheless, the popular conception exists that we do not commune during Theophany because we will receive Hagiasmos and "it is the same." On the other hand, as for the fasting prior to Great Hagiasmos, this was also probably fostered by an analogy to the modern custom of fasting prior to holy communion, but which could not also itself be expanded to a three-day interval, due to the fact that prior to Theophany the days of the festive twelve-day period have "consumption of everything," except, obviously, the eve. As for this fasting of the eve, which is commonly considered to be done for the Hagiasmos, it is irrelevant to the latter and is observed whether one is going to partake of it or not. For this reason, also, the fast is not broken after any drinking of the Hagiasmos during the eve. It has its origins in the ancient custom for a one day fasting of the entire Church to precede the great feasts (as it is commonly said) either for the baptism of catechumens which was done during them, or, rather irrelevant to Hagiasmos, as one of the many ways for elevation of the main day of the feast and of preparation for it with fasting, abstinence, and prayer. But it is also apparent that it does not relate to the drinking

---

and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, ed./trans., *The Festal Menaion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), 356.

936. PG 155:237b.

of the Hagiasmos both from the fact that the Hagiasmos is not only celebrated—and consequently is drunk—also during the eve, according to the modern custom, the eve of which[937] fasting never precedes, and from the fact that the eve also often happens not to be a fasting day when it coincides with Saturday or Sunday.

Namely, does not fasting precede the drinking of Great Hagiasmos? Yes, of course. But it is not understood to be stricter and of a longer length than the fasting for approaching holy communion, the so-called "eucharistic fast." And the latter, as we have been given the opportunity to write before, is clear and inviolable, with an invariable exception when there exists danger of death. In other words, the complete abstention of food and drink from supper or from midnight of the preceding day up until communion, at any time it takes place, namely, in the morning during non-fasting days and in the evening during fasting days. But as we saw, the celebration and the drinking of Great Hagiasmos is provided for by our ecclesiastical taxis and tradition after the holy partaking and prior to the eating of antidōron, namely, more liturgically—we repeat it—between the exclamation of the prayer of thanksgiving after "all partake"[938] ("For you are our sanctification...") according to the older taxis, or after the prayer behind the ambōn according to the modern one, and "Blessed be the name of the Lord..." and the subsequent distribution of antidōron and dismissal.

According to the Fathers and the Church's tradition, fasting is a "great good."[939] However, it operates within certain time and quality standards from tradition, which we are called upon to point out and make use of. However, extending fasting beyond these limits can have negative effects and ultimately be to the detriment of God's will itself and the goal of the Church,[940] which is the sanctification of the faithful and all creation through reception of and sprinkling by the

937. The eve of the eve, namely, the day prior to the eve (the "προπαραμονή," proparamonē).

938. "τὸ πάντας μεταλαβεῖν."

939. "μέγα καλόν."

940. On the "goal of the Church" ("σκοπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας"), Phountoulēs often cites Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation*, 94 (in Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 151).

water of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany. When it coincides with Saturday or Sunday, the recommendation for xerophagy during the supper of the eve can be a good compromise of the old and modern traditions. Namely, this is the extension in some manner of the eucharistic fast within reasonable limits.

In closing this lengthy answer that attempts to respond to the repetitive questions related to the Hagiasmos of Theophany, let one more brief reference be permitted to the so-called "Prologue" or "Introduction of Holy Theophany," concerning which an extensive discussion took place in the answer to question 391. We will not repeat what is thoroughly elaborated there regarding the manuscript tradition of this "Prologue" and the standard rubrics that prescribe points related to its recitation, nor to the philological observations that deal with its relation to the prayer of the consecration of the water, "Great are you, O Lord...." The newer questions are confined to other subjects, which are chiefly related to the time of its recitation, namely, if it is also said during both celebrations of the Great Hagiasmos, if it is only said during one and at which, and if the reading or not of the Prologue constitutes a differentiating element among the two sanctifications of water on the eve and the day of the feast.

This is about the magisterial rhetorical introduction from "Trinity beyond all being..."[941] up until "in compunction cry out to you."[942] The present instability in the referenced taxis is very old. It was not said in the Great Church and does not exist in many manuscripts. It was said in some places as an encomium of the feast gathered from various patristic homilies, in the absence of a live sermon. When the double celebration of the Hagiasmos became prevalent, we have in the standard rubrics of the manuscripts all the possible variations that survive up until nowadays. Namely, either being also said during both celebrations of the Hagiasmos or only one, depending on the emphasis that was given to each of them. As long as the celebration of the Hagiasmos during the vigil of the eve still retained its old splendor, it was said during the latter. When the weight and

941. "Τριὰς ὑπερούσιε..."
942. "ἐν κατανύξει βοῶ σοι."

formality were shifted later to the main day, the Prologue was then also said on it. But this precisely showed that the encomium did not affect the consecration. Namely, whether the Prologue was said or not, it did not taint the character of the Great Hagiasmos as well as the equivalence of the two consecrations. It is not the recitation of the encomium that makes the one "small" and the other "great." Nowadays, the taxis customarily prevails for the encomium to be said on the day of the feast and to be omitted during the eve. And this is consistent with the prevailing downgrading of the eve and the elevation of the main day of the feast. In the past, the opposite happened, for this reason also this encomium was recited during the Hagiasmos of the eve. Its reading or its not reading, as well as the time of its reading, remained up until the complete prevalence of the printed service books, and for a long period afterwards, at the priest's discretion ("if you wish," "if you wish, it is said," "if he has...or does not have," "if you wish to say this," according to the rubrics of various manuscripts). This is not a word of prayer addressed to God, but a festal homily for the faithful, even if it leaves the impression that it is a prayer due to the trinitarian introduction of its opening and the conglomerate character of its text.

In the answers to questions 157 and 220, we wrote regarding topics that relate to the eves of the Nativity and Theophany. Regarding what concerns the Great Hagiasmos, apart from the answer to question 391, we also refer to questions 35, 126, 208, 220–221, and 546–547.

561

What is the dismissal for Pascha, "May He who rose from the dead Christ our true..."[943] or "May He who rose from the dead [and] trampling on death by death and to those in the tombs granting life Christ our true..."[944]?

The more prevalent forms for the characteristics of the dismissals for feasts of the Lord are derived either from a brief adaptation of the

943. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός..."

944. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός [καί] θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον πατήσας καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι ζωὴν χαρισάμενος Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός..."

ephymnion of the third antiphon for the feast (the eisodikon) or the ephymnion of the third antiphon being repeated unchanged. It is done like this in the dismissals for Theophany, the Meeting of Christ, Palm Sunday, the Ascension, the Transfiguration, and Sundays. The characteristics of the dismissals for Great Thursday, the service of the Holy Passions, and Great Friday (note that these days do not have antiphons and an eisodikon), as well as the Nativity, Pentecost, and Vespers of Kneeling have a different structure. "May the Lord who is coming..."[945] of the first three days of Great Week is influenced by the very well-known first stichēron of lauds for Great Monday.[946] We confirm a similar influence from the hymnography of feasts in characteristics of dismissals that are possibly derived from the liturgical tradition of Southern Italy, but did not become prevalent, such as "May He who voluntarily was raised on the Cross..."[947] for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, which was influenced by the kontakion for the feast with the same beginning, as well as "May He who trampled on death and instructed Thomas..."[948] for the Sunday of Thomas, similarly influenced by the doxastikon of the stichēra for Vespers, "When the doors had been shut...,"[949] of the plagal of

945. "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος..."

946. The text of the first stichēron of lauds for Great Monday is the following:

Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος, πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον Πάθος, τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ παραδοθήσεται ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ. Δεῦτε οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς, κεκαθαρμέναις διανοίαις, συμπορευθῶμεν αὐτῷ, καὶ συσταυρωθῶμεν, καὶ νεκρωθῶμεν δι' αὐτόν, ταῖς τοῦ βίου ἡδοναῖς· ἵνα καὶ συζήσωμεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀκούσωμεν βοῶντος αὐτοῦ· Οὐκέτι εἰς τὴν ἐπίγειον Ἱερουσαλήμ, διὰ τὸ παθεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρά μου, καὶ Πατέρα ὑμῶν, καὶ Θεόν μου, καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν· καὶ συνανυψῶ ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐν τῇ Βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

947. "Ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἑκουσίως..."

948. "Ὁ τὸν θάνατον πατήσας καὶ τὸν Θωμᾶν πληροφορήσας..."

949. " Τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων... The full text for the doxastikon with the text underlined that influenced the dismissal is the following: "Τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, ἐπέστης Χριστὲ πρὸς τοὺς Μαθητάς. Τότε ὁ Θωμᾶς, οἰκονομικῶς οὐχ εὑρέθη μετ' αὐτῶν· ἔλεγε γάρ· Οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω κἀγὼ τὸν Δεσπότην· ἴδω τὴν πλευράν, ὅθεν ἐξῆλθε τὸ αἷμα, τὸ ὕδωρ, τὸ βάπτισμα· ἴδω τὴν πληγήν, ἐξ ἧς ἰάθη τὸ μέγα τραῦμα ὁ ἄνθρωπος· ἴδω, πῶς οὐκ ἦν, ὡς πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ

second tone for this feast. Attractive, but these are innovations and unsupported cases.

The dismissal for Pascha constitutes a more glaring and extreme instance of a troparion's influence, such as it is presented in the Hieratikon of Rome's edition (1950), p. 87, which also from its obvious influence is also introduced into the Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia's edition (1977), pp. 19 and 79, which indeed is generalized "up until its leavetaking" (namely, of Pascha).[950] "Christ is risen from the dead..."[951] is introduced whole into this dismissal, replacing thus the common characteristic of Pascha and Sundays, "May He who rose from the dead Christ our true...." The reason is obvious. The frequent repetition of the resurrectional dismissal to be sure is wearing and the introduction of "Christ is risen..." into the Paschal dismissal can be understood as an attempt for a stimulation of attention and a rejuvenation of this important point of the service. However, in no manner can one approve it. Apart from the fact that it does not have support in our tradition, it creates a lax and verbose form, which cannot be compared to the simple and wondrous, "May He who rose from the dead...." If from frequent use it loses its dynamism, let us make sure to give this back to it, emphasizing and explaining and not destroying and replacing it. Besides, the use of the same form of dismissal in the annual Pascha of the Church as well as on Sunday, the weekly Pascha, is not random. It underlines with the end of the service the sameness of the subject for both; the Lord's Resurrection from the dead.

σάρξ καὶ ὀστέα. Ὁ τὸν θάνατον πατήσας, καὶ Θωμᾶν πληροφορήσας, Κύριε, δόξα σοι."

950. *Ἱερατικὸν περιέχον τὰς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ὄρθρου, τὰς θείας καὶ ἱερὰς Λειτουργίας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῶν συνήθων προσθηκῶν* (Rome: n.p., 1950), 87.

951. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν..."

562

In the hymn, "Φῶς ἱλαρόν" (O Gladsome Light), there exists the phrase "ἄξιόν σε ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς ὑμνεῖσθαι φωναῖς αἰσίαις" (it is proper at all times for you to be praised with fitting voices). Some correct "αἰσίαις" (fitting) to "ὁσίαις" (blessed), because they view "αἰσίαις" (fitting) as an error and "ὁσίαις" (blessed) as correct. How must it be said?[952]

The "Lamp-lighting hymn"[953] or the "Lamp-lighting thanksgiving,"[954] "Gladsome Light," is one of the most ancient hymns of our Church and is found in liturgical use for at least seventeen hundred years. In his treatise to Amphilochios of Iconium concerning the Holy Spirit (chapter 29), Basileios the Great provides us with the most ancient witness regarding it as well as a fragment of its text. Basileios the Great quotes this hymn as an argument for the Church's faith all along concerning the divinity of the Holy Spirit and views it as an "ancient expression,"[955] which as a witness ("on account of [its] antiquity")[956] had special authority. In addition, he testifies that this hymn was chanted by the people, according to the tradition of the Fathers ("it seemed good to our Fathers"),[957] as a thanksgiving during the reception of the grace "of the evening light,"[958] namely, during the lighting of the lamps. And while we do not know who

952. The text of the Hymn is as follows:

Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης ἀθανάτου Πατρός, οὐρανίου, ἁγίου, μάκαρος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλίου δύσιν, ἰδόντες φῶς ἑσπερινόν, ὑμνοῦμεν Πατέρα, Υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Θεόν. Ἄξιόν σε ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς ὑμνεῖσθαι φωναῖς αἰσίαις, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, ζωὴν ὁ διδούς· διʼ ὃ ὁ κόσμος σὲ δοξάζει.	O Gladsome Light of the holy glory of the immortal Father, heavenly, holy, blessed, Jesus Christ, having come to the setting of the sun, beholding the evening light, we praise Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, God. It is proper at all times for you to be praised with fitting voices, Son of God, the giver of life; wherefore the world glorifies you.

953. "ἐπιλύχνιος ὕμνος."
954. "ἐπιλύχνιος εὐχαριστία."
955. "ἀρχαίαν φωνήν." Here, "φωνήν," is used in the sense of "expression," or even "formula."
956. "διὰ τοῦ χρόνου τὴν ἀρχαιότητα."
957. "ἔδοξε τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν."
958. "τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ φωτός."

the composer of this hymn is and, naturally, neither also the time of its composition, nor did also Basileios the Great know him ("Who is the father of these words of thanksgiving at the lighting of lamps, we cannot say").[959] Its attribution to the martyr Athenogenēs came from a confusion that was caused by a superficial reading of Basileios the Great's text, who then immediately refers to another ancient trinitarian hymn, a composition of Athenogenēs, but clearly distinguishes it from "O Gladsome Light": "And if anyone also knows the composition of Athenogenēs, which he bequeathed as a farewell gift to his friends...also knows the opinion of the martyrs...."[960]

A purpose of our above reference to the otherwise well-known issues concerning the hymn, "O Gladsome Light," is not for us to expand on the various problems associated with it, which have been dealt with specifically or incidentally by many wise people. However, we wish to make it clear that such an old hymn, which already for Basileios the Great was an "ancient expression," which already from the middle of the fourth century was widely known by the people, and which since then was found in daily liturgical and (as it seems) extra-liturgical use, was expected to undergo corruptions and corrections during use, during copying, during translations (there exist translations in all the ancient languages), during recitation by heart, and for other reasons. In these seventeen centuries, it was copied and chanted or recited a myriad of times and it was natural that this long history left its mark on its text, no matter how brief this text might be, until with the prevalence of printing the consolidation of the text occurred in the form the manuscripts handed down to us that the first publishers were aware of. This also happened with all our liturgical and hymnological texts. Without this meaning that those selections of the first publishers were the best (indeed with the

959. "καὶ ὅστις μὲν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίου εὐχαριστίας, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν."

960. "εἰ δέ τις καὶ τὸν ὕμνον Ἀθηνογένους ἔγνω, ὃν ὥσπερ τι ἐξιτήριον τοῖς συνοῦσιν αὐτῷ καταλέλοιπεν... οἶδε καὶ τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων γνώμην..." Saint Basileios the Great, *Treatise concerning the Holy Spirit,* 29 in *Basile de Césarée, Traité du Saint-Esprit,* ed. and trans. Benoit Pruche, SC 17 (Paris: Cerf, 1947), 250–251. Compare also the translation in Antonia Tripolitis, "Φῶς Ἱλαρόν: Ancient Hymn and Modern Enigma," *Vigiliae Christianae,* 24 (1970): 189–196.

means and capabilities of that period and the practical objectives of the publications), but that they created a new stable textual tradition from which it was no longer easy and possible to depart. We write these things because we will also use them in other questions that relate to topics of the textual criticism of prayers or hymns.

Already the text that Basileios the Great quotes in *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, though it is scarcely one or two verses of the hymn, has three such corruptions or variants. The latter writes: "αἰνοῦμεν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα Θεοῦ" (we praise Father and Son and Holy Spirit of God). The contemporary text is "ὑμνοῦμεν (we praise)[961] [instead of 'αἰνοῦμεν'] Father ['καί' (and) is omitted], Son and Holy Spirit God (Θεόν) ['Θεοῦ' (of God) was apparently corrected later to 'Θεόν' (God), in order to express more clearly than the original the belief concerning the divinity of the Holy Spirit and for any confusions to be avoided]." These three different readings are not the only ones that are encountered in this hymn, which is remarkably preserved in many manuscripts and, as we already said, in ancient translations. We note them to show where the hurried and uncritical adoption of all these variants can lead and how much confusion it can cause in liturgical texts. Only in cases of proven errors and after thorough critical research and fortification from reliable manuscripts and other sources do such corrections have a reason. For example, we cite respectively, in questions 12, 199, 200, 13, 100, 198, 397, 512, 533, and 550: "ἀνεξάρτητον" instead of the correct "ἀνεξάρνητον" in the prayer of the eighth day, "τὴν βιοτικήν" instead of "νῦν βιοτικήν" in the Cherubic hymn, "σοὶ προσφέρομεν" instead of "σοὶ προσφέροντες" of our Liturgies' prayer of the anaphora, but also "ἐκύησε" instead of "ἐκίσσησε" of the Fiftieth Psalm, "κακῶς πλεόντων" instead of "καλῶς πλεόντων" in "Εὐξώμεθα...,"[962] "ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ" instead of "ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ" of the resurrectional apolytikion for the plagal of the second tone, "σχῆμα" instead of "πρόσχημα" in the prayer of inclination of the Hagiasmoi,

961. "ὑμνέω," also has the meaning of to "sing in praise of," but is often rendered to "praise."

962. "Let us pray..." Namely, the last petitions of Compline and the Midnight Office.

"Ἡ Παρθένος Δέσποινα" instead of "Ἡ Παρθένος σήμερον" of the forefeast kontakion of the Nativity, "καθ' ἑκάστην" instead of "κατὰ νύκτα" of "It is good to acknowledge the Lord..."[963] of Matins, and "ὑποδεξάμενοι" instead "ὑποδεξόμενοι" of the Cherubic hymn.

In the hymn, "O Gladsome Light," apart from the three different readings that we already noted ("αἰνοῦμεν" instead of "ὑμνοῦμεν," "καὶ Υἱόν" instead of "Υἱόν," and "Θεοῦ" instead of "Θεόν"), which we encountered in the quotation of Basileios the Great and in manuscripts, and apart from "ὁσίαις" (blessed) instead of "αἰσίαις" (fitting) (regarding which the question occurs and with which also alone we will be occupied below), at least ten other significant variants are encountered in Greek manuscripts. And these, such as "φωναῖς αἰσίαις" (fitting voices) or "ὁσίαις" (blessed) could be discussed and, at least for some of them, a correction proposed of the readings that became prevalent in the now accepted text of the hymn. Naturally, this would lead without a serious reason to the complete overturning of the well-known, generally accepted, and current text in use.

The different readings are the following:

- "Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" instead of "Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ"
- "ἐλθόντος" instead of "ἐλθόντες"
- "ἄξιος εἶ" or "ἄξιος σύ" instead of "ἄξιόν σε"
- "πᾶσι" instead of "ἓν πᾶσι"
- "ἐν φωναῖς" instead of "φωναῖς"
- "δι' ὅν" or "δι' οὗ" or "δι' ὧν" instead of "δι' ὅ"
- "ἑορτάζει" instead of "σέ δοξάζει"[964]

After this long, but necessary, wandering introduction, let us attempt to deal with the dilemma between the two texts; is it "φωναῖς αἰσίαις" (fitting voices) or "φωναῖς ὁσίαις" (blessed voices)? Both texts are encountered in the manuscripts, the second more rarely ("ὁσίαις," blessed), the first more frequently ("αἰσίαις," fitting), especially in modern manuscripts, where it is no doubt the prevalent one. However, this does not mean much because the issues of textual criticism are not resolved in some manner by majority vote.

963. "Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ..." (Psalm 91:2).

964. See the Greek text of hymn above for comparisons.

"Αἱσίαις" (fitting) becomes prevalent, but "ὁσίαις" (blessed) is also attested to by several equally old manuscripts. Of the 105 codices from the ninth up until the nineteenth centuries where the hymn, "O Gladsome Light," has been noted, seven have "φωναῖς ὁσίαις" (blessed voices) and all the remaining ones, "φωναῖς αἱσίαις" (fitting voices). Is this a case of a copying, auditory, or optical mistake? If yes, which is the original and correct one and which is the mistaken one? Did "αἱσίαις" (fitting) become "ὁσίαις" (blessed) or did "ὁσίαις" (blessed) become "αἱσίαις" (fitting)? In principle, both are equally possible. Both adjectives have equal syllables with the accent on the second one (-- ´-). They differ only according to the first syllable, which easily visually in uncial, and even in minuscule, manuscripts can, due to similarity of marks, be mistakenly read (AI-O or αἰ-ὁ). In these cases, the more difficult reading is considered the original one. In this case, "αἱσίαις" (fitting) is a more difficult reading, while "ὁσίαις" (blessed) is the more frequent and easier in ecclesiastical texts. According to the principles of textual criticism, it is impossible for the copyist to see or to hear "ὁσίαις" (blessed) and to have written "αἱσίαις" (fitting), while the opposite is possible and common.

We are also led to the same conclusion by one other avenue. Namely, if this is not a case of a copying error, then we have a conscious insertion into the text, a correction. But now the same dilemma arises, which is addressed with a rationale similar to the previous one. Which was the original reading and which the correction and for which reason was it done?[965] Was "αἱσίαις" (fitting) corrected to "ὁσίαις" (blessed) or "ὁσίαις" (blessed) to "αἱσίαις" (fitting)? "Αἱσίαις" (fitting) is a word relatively rare in Christian texts, with a purely secular meaning (auspicious, agreeable, pleasant, joyful, suitable), which is not encountered whole or in its derivatives in Holy Scripture. Conversely, "ὁσίαις" (blessed), a word with religious and spiritual meaning (holy, sacred, chaste, pure) and its derivatives (ὁσίως, ὁσιότης, ὁσιοῦν) are words and concepts common and beloved in ecclesiastical language. They are encountered 72 times in the Old Testament and 10 in the New Testament with often a li-

965. In the text, the question mark is missing. It is supplied in the translation for clarity.

turgical meaning: "Might serve him in holiness (ὁσιότητι) and righteousness" (Luke 1:74–75), "I desire...for men to pray...lifting holy (ὁσίους) hands" (1 Timothy 2:8). In the Old Testament, in two of the most currently used psalms, among others, we have parallel passages, in which not only is the disputed word ("ὅσιος" blessed) encountered, but also "ὕμνος" (hymn) and "αἴνεσις" (praise) which recall "ὑμνεῖσθαι" (to be praised or sung in praise of) or "αἰνεῖσθαι" (to be praised) according to the alternative reading of the preceding line of "O Gladsome Light": "A Hymn belongs to all his blessed ones (ὁσίοις)"[966] (Psalm 148:14) and "His praise (αἴνεσις) is in an assembly of blessed ones (ὁσίων)"[967] (Psalm 149:1). The attraction from these two verses is clear in the reading, "φωναῖς ὁσίαις" (blessed voices). Here also again the correction to "αἰσίαις" (fitting) is impossible if the original reading was "ὁσίαις" (blessed). Conversely, "ὁσίαις" (blessed) attests to a pious insertion of a corrector who either was scandalized by the secular meaning of the adjective "αἰσίαις" (fitting) or, in any case, wished to give a more pious and sacred character to the doxological praise of God's people. Here also it is inconceivable that "ὁσίαις" (blessed) originally existed and was corrected to "αἰσίαις" (fitting). However, this adjective is also better suited with the hymn's antiquity and with the characteristic adjective "ἱλαρόν" (gladsome) at the beginning, which also gives a joyous tone to the entire hymn. Also compare the reading "δι' ὅ (on account of which) [or "δι' οὗ" or "δι' ὧν" or "δι' ὅν"] the world celebrates (ὁ κόσμος ἑορτάζει)" of the end.[968]

Consistent with all the points above, the original and correct reading must be "φωναῖς αἰσίαις" (fitting voices).

966. "Ὕμνος πᾶσι τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ."

967. "Ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁσίων."

968. Phountoulēs is pointing out that this variant may have been influenced by the joyous tone of the hymn.

563

In the funereal prayer, "O God of spirits…,"[969] the phrase, "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταργήσας" (who trampled down death and abolished the power of the devil) is corrected to "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταργήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταπατήσας" (who abolished death and trampled down the devil) or "ὁ τὸν διάβολον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ θάνατον καταργήσας" (who trampled down the devil and abolished death). Which is more correct?[970]

After the preceding answer, which referred to the topic of textual criticism for the ancient hymn, "O Gladsome Light" ("φωναῖς αἱσίαις," fitting voices, or "ὁσίαις," blessed) and of all that we wrote there, it is opportune for us to deal with the answer to the question above, which remained to be studied for several years. It has recently taken on topicality and quite a few controversial things were written about it. We dealt with this ancient funereal prayer (which is one of the most wonderful texts of our Euchologion for the brief and succinct manner of the entreaty's formulation, the clarity of speech, and its biblical and theological content) in question 487, which concerned an issue, again of textual criticism, of its exclamation: "ὁ λόγος σου" (your word) or "ὁ νόμος σου" (your law) is "ἀλήθεια" (truth).[971]

Regarding the phrase that occupies us in the present question, we also encounter the three variations above in the manuscripts and in the printed editions, a matter that shows that its text on this point perhaps generated some theological concern and at times caused corrections and intercalations. Of course, we are accustomed to the first form, "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταργήσας" (who trampled down death and abolished the power of the devil), which seems to be the most prevalent one in the manuscripts and the printed editions. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is also the correct or the only correct one, while the other forms are mistaken. Neither inherently could we exclude the possibility

969. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων…"

970. "καταργεῖν" will be translated "to abolish" regarding death; and "to make powerless," namely, "to abolish the power of," regarding the devil.

971. "ὁ λόγος σου [ἢ "ὁ νόμος σου"] ἀλήθεια."

that this is a case of a copying error, a mistaken reading, or an incorrect rendering from memory in a text indeed so frequently used. All these possible instances (theological correction, copying or mnemonic error) need to be examined objectively and impartially and to be addressed with the appropriate strictness and seriousness in each case and, particularly, in this most sacred prayer.

And first, a look at the manuscript tradition. We are talking about a text that is encountered in a great multitude of manuscripts and in quite a few ancient burial inscriptions, papyri, and indirect references of Fathers. It is considered as the most ancient prayer for the dead, but in some manuscripts, it is attributed to Basileios the Great, although it is probably older. It is naturally impossible for us to cite all these manuscripts and other sources. However, it must be considered certain that the original reading in the disputed phrase was "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταργήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταπατήσας" (who abolished death and trampled down the devil). This form is attested to by the most ancient and trustworthy manuscripts, by inscriptions, and, indeed, by the most ancient codex of an Euchologion that survived, *Barberini 336*, from the end of the eighth century.[972] We encounter a direct reference to this text in Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who annotating it in his *Dialogue* (chapter 366) notes: "The priest...himself saying 'God of spirits,' namely, of the angels and souls, 'and all flesh,' namely, of corporeal human beings, 'who abolished death' by death (τὸν διὰ θανάτου καταργήσαντα) 'and trampled down the devil' by the cross (διὰ σταυροῦ τὸν διάβολον καταπατήσαντα) 'and bestowed life to the world' by death (διὰ νεκρώσεως ζωὴν χορηγήσαντα τῷ κόσμῳ)...."[973]

The other reading, "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταργήσας" (who trampled down death and abolished the power of the devil) is also encountered in many manuscripts. In the question, a third equivalent variant is also noted: "ὁ τὸν διάβολον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ θάνατον καταργήσας" (who trampled down the devil and abol-

---

972. Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 264.2.

973. PG 155:684c–685d. Quotations are added for clarity.

ished death). Other different readings of smaller significance also exist, such as, "πατήσας" (who trampled on) instead of "καταπατήσας" (who trampled down), "τὸν ᾅδην καταπατήσας" (who trampled down Hades) instead of "τὸν διάβολον" (the devil) and "καὶ τόν" (and the) instead of "τὸν δέ" (and the). The strange thing, but not inexplicable, is that in later and not as reliable manuscripts, if they happen to have the prayer two or more times, they quote it sometimes with the one and other times with the other form. Of all these let us stay on the reading "πατήσας" (who trampled on) as well as also the presence of both variants in the same codex. They appear unimportant but indicate much. Namely, it is clear that the text of the prayer during its copying, as well as during its recitation from memory, which must have certainly been very frequent, was influenced by other equally well-known texts of Holy Scripture or of hymnology. "Ὁ τὸν θάνατον πατήσας" (who trampled on death) is clearly derived from an influence of the universally well-known troparion of Pascha, "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη...θανάτῳ θάνατον πατήσας... (Christ is risen...trampling on death by death...), as well as many other troparia well-known to the copyist. This is also attested to by the fact that the same copyist, in the same codex and in the same service, who being misguided by his memory and influenced by the troparia, at a moment of relaxing his attention reverses the object ("διάβολον," devil – "θάνατον," death) or the participle ("καταργήσας," who abolished – "καταπατήσας," who trampled down), but at moments of clearheadedness copied the correct and original text that he had before him or that was dictated to him.

From the viewpoint of content, both forms are correct. Let this not seem strange. The phrase refers to the Lord Jesus Christ, who by His death and Resurrection from the dead as to Himself, both abolished death and trampled down the devil. And conversely: He both trampled down death and abolished the power of the devil. Death here, just as in the New Testament, the apocryphal gospel of Nikodēmos, and hymnography is presented personified, identical with hades, which we saw in a variant. Moreover, "καταπατεῖν" (to trample down) is identical with "νικᾶν" (to conquer.) Thus, personified from the influence of the sources above, we also see it in sacred

iconography in the representation of the Resurrection ("The Descent into Hades"),[974] where Christ "πατεῖ/νικᾶ" (tramples on/conquers) death personified or Hades or the devil, which are depicted as one or two black-figured old men. Consequently, the objection that is put forward that the devil as an individual can be trampled down, while death as impersonal cannot, comes to naught. And the latter, by poetic license, is personified, just as even happens in the Revelation of John (20:10).[975]

According to the Apostle Paul, Christ abolished death (2 Timothy 1:10: "καταργήσαντος" [abolished] death), but at the same time also abolished the power of the devil (Hebrews 2:14: "he might καταργήση [abolish][976] the power of the one who has power over death, namely, the devil"). The abolition of the power of the devil or of death is achieved "by the death of Christ" (Hebrews 2:14) and by His Resurrection, since "being raised from the dead he dies no more, death no longer has dominion over him" (Romans 6:9). Commenting on the first passage (2 Timothy 1:10), Theophylaktos writes that, "in his own body [Christ] efficaciously abolished death, immortalizing it"[977] and Theodōrētos on Romans 6:9 justifying "no longer has dominion"[978] adds: "for [Christ] now has an immortal body."[979] Many Fathers and ecclesiastical writers speak regarding the

974. "Ἡ εἰς Ἅδου κάθοδος."

975. A better citation might be Revelation 20:14, which mentions death.

976. In this passage, "καταργήση" is sometimes translated "might destroy."

977. "ἐν μὲν τῷ οἰκείῳ σώματι [ὁ Χριστός] κατήργησεν ἐμπράκτως τὸν θάνατον, ἀφθαρτίσας αὐτό," (PG 125: 96c–96d). On "immortalizing" (ἀφθαρτίσας), see Lampe, "ἀφθαρτίζω." The "it" (αὐτό) here refers to "body." Theophylaktos (Hēphaistos) (Θεοφύλακτος [Ἥφαιστος]) of Ochrid (born mid-eleventh century–d. after 1125) was formerly a deacon of the cathedral of Saint Sophia in Constantinople, where he was educated in the 1070s and held the post of master of the rhetoricians while teaching in the patriarchal school. He was appointed as the fifth Byzantine archbishop of Ochrid on January 6, 1088, and wrote a large number of works, including Scriptural commentaries. For further information, see Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 158–172 and Margaret Mullet, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (London: Routledge, 1997).

978. "οὐκέτι κυριεύει."

979. "ἀθάνατον γὰρ νῦν ἔχει [ὁ Χριστός] τὸ σῶμα," (PG 82:108a). Theodōrētos (Θεοδώρητος) of Cyrus (393–d. 460–466). For a brief overview of his life

abolition of death and of the power of the devil by Christ according to the sense above, such as Saint Kyrillos of Jerusalem (*Catechesis* 19. 4: "he abolished death by death"),[980] Clement the Alexandrian in the *Paidagōgos* (2. 8: "abolished the power of the devil"),[981] Origen (*On Jeremiah* 7. 3: "on account of Christ coming and abolishing the power of the ruler of this age")[982] and many others.

With the same meaning, "καταργεῖν," (to abolish or to abolish the power of) death or the devil, is most frequently encountered in our ecclesiastical hymnography, always referring to Christ, just as also in the New Testament and in the Fathers. We select some characteristic phrases from troparia of the Oktōēchos: "he abolished the dominion of death"[983] (second tone, second stichēron of Saturday Vespers), "he has destroyed the dominion of death and the deception of the devil is abolished"[984] (third tone, first stichēron of Vespers), "and by your death…you abolished the power of the devil"[985] (fourth tone, second stichēron of lauds), "you abolished the force of death"[986] (fourth tone, sixth stichēron of lauds), and Hebrews 2:14 verbatim in the sixth stichēron of Vespers of the plagal of the second tone, "you made powerless the one who has the power over death."[987]

The expression "πατεῖν" (to trample on) or with the intensification, "κατά(πατεῖν)" (to trample down) death or the devil, is not

---

and writings, especially commentaries on Scripture, see Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on the Letters of St. Paul* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001), 1:1–25.

980. "καταργήσῃ θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον," Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis 1*, 4 in *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. Auguste Piédagnel and trans. Pierre Paris, SC 126 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966), 88.

981. "διάβολον καταργήσας," Clement of Alexandria, Paidagōgos 2. 8. 73, 3 in *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue, Livre II*, trad. Claude Mondésert, SC 108 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965), 148.

982. "τὸν ἐπιδημήσαντα Χριστὸν καὶ καταργήσαντα τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου," Origen, *On Jeremiah* 2. 8 in *Origène, Homélies sur Jérémie*, ed. Pierre Nautin and trans. Pierre Husson and Pierre Nautin, SC 232 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976), 350.

983. "τοῦ θανάτου τὸ κράτος κατήργησε."

984. "θανάτου κράτος λέλυται καὶ διαβόλου ἡ πλάνη κατήργηται," (Saturday Vespers).

985. "καὶ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ… διάβολον κατήργησας," (Sunday Matins).

986. "θανάτου κατήργησας τὴν ἰσχύν," (Sunday Matins).

987. "κατήργησας τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου," (Saturday Vespers).

encountered verbatim in the New Testament, but is identical with the prior expression,[988] however, more vivid and more readily perceived and understood than the legal term "καταργεῖν" (to abolish or make powerless). Also, for this reason, it is used innumerable times in Paschal hymnography and in the Oktōēchos. Classic examples are "Christ is risen...trampling on death..." and the same phrase in the eighth stichēron of lauds of the second tone, in the apolytikion and in the fifth stichēron of lauds of the third tone, in the seventh stichēron for Vespers of the fourth tone, in the seventh stichēron for Vespers of the plagal of the first tone, in the second and third stichēra of Vespers of plagal of the second tone, and so forth.

Therefore, in all the instances, and in the funereal prayer, the abolition of death or the power of the devil and the trampling down again of death or the devil relates to the person of Christ, the victor over death and, on account of the Resurrection, "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (1 Corinthians 15:20) and "the firstborn of the dead" (Revelation 1:5). As to us human beings and the world, neither death nor the devil have been abolished or trampled down "in actuality," but only "in potentiality" thanks to Christ's death and Resurrection. As long as the habitation[989] of this world endures, "all will die in Adam" (1 Corinthians 15:22). On the last day, "all will be given life in Christ" through the general[990] resurrection. At that time, "the last enemy to be destroyed is death" (1 Corinthians 15:26). "Therefore, in potentiality even now it is abolished, but in actuality at that time" (Chrysostomos).[991] The devil, death, and Hades will be put into the "lake of fire" (Revelation 20:10, 14), which signifies the definitive victory over the devil and death ("Death will be no more," Revelation 21:4). However, the prayer, as well as Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and the sacred hymnographers, are referring not to the trampling down or abolishing the power of the devil or death for

988. Namely, "καταργεῖν."

989. "σκηνή" is being used in the sense of "σκῆνος" as a tent, a temporary habitation, metaphorically of the body.

990. "κοινή," means "common," but in English the resurrection of all is referred to as the "universal" or "general" resurrection.

991. PG 61:338.5. Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Homily* 39.4.

human beings, which has not yet taken place except in potentiality, but to Christ, who, we repeat, trampled down and abolished the power of the devil and death both in potentiality and in actuality. Consequently, a correction of the prayer based on "theological" criteria is pedantic and pointless. Time for us to summarize:

The original reading of the text of the prayer, "O God of spirits..." is "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταργήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταπατήσας" (who abolished death and trampled down the devil), as it is attested to by the most reliable and oldest manuscripts. The later form that became prevalent, "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταργήσας" (who trampled down death and abolished the power of the devil), (also correct just as the first form concerning content) originated from an influence of hymnography, where the expression, "τὸν θάνατον [κατα]πατήσας" (trampling [down] on death), is more frequent due to its liveliness and vividness. And both variant phrases are identical or nearly identical and refer to Christ's victory over death and the devil, by His voluntary death by Crucifixion and His glorious Resurrection. After this victory, the devil and death while they lost their power are continuing to exist up until the end times. Humanity is still subject to the temptation of the devil and the corruption of death. However, the prayer refers to the Lord Jesus Christ.

564

How many hours must one fast in order to receive communion during the celebration of the evening Presanctified, which is customarily celebrated on Wednesdays of Great Lent?

The celebration of the evening Presanctified during Great Lent, especially on the day of Wednesday, is tending to become prevalent during recent years and constitutes a comforting phenomenon of a return to the Church's correct practice, after centuries of an application of a practice "by oikonomia." Experience in the meanwhile showed that, not only the spirit and the meaning of the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified in the framework of Great Lent is completely in danger of extinction with its transfer during the morning hours, but even this pastoral expediency is nonexistent.

The days of its celebration are working ones for all, and the morning hours only serve retirees. Conversely, its celebration during the evening, at the time natural all along and from its inception for its celebration, not only returns matters to their correct place, but also effectively makes it easier for the working and non-working faithful to participate in it.

It is a well-known fact that the Presanctified is not a "Liturgy" in the precise and particular meaning of this term. Namely, it is not a celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, an offering of gifts and a consecration, a "proskomidē" according to the ancient meaning of this term.[992] It is an offering of holy communion within a liturgical framework during the evening synaxis. Also, for this reason, it is clearly distinguished in two parts, the service of Vespers up until also the second prayer of the faithful (Vespers in its ancient "asmatic"/parish form also contained a prayer for the catechumens and two prayers of the faithful) and the taxis for holy communion from "Now the powers of the heavens..."[993] onwards, according to a precise imitation of the corresponding section of the Divine Liturgy. The goal of its celebration is nothing other than the facilitation of Christians to approach holy communion, not only during Great Lent's Saturdays and Sundays, during which the "complete" Divine Liturgy is celebrated, but also in the middle of the week, days during which, due to their mournful–penitential character, the Paschal mystery of the Holy Eucharist cannot be celebrated.

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki uses a very expressive term for the characterization of the above goal for the establishment of the Presanctified. He characterizes it as an "ἐπινόηση"–a device–of the Holy Fathers for the circumvention of the impasse ("The Presanctified Liturgy...we believe that this is what has been done from the beginning on account of this fast, so that we mourn and do not celebrate on the days of mourning...Therefore, lest we happen to have no share at all of the Grace from the mysteries of Christ and of the atonement through the sacred prayers, this has been devised (ἐπινενόηται) by the Fathers. And around the ninth hour, we celebrate this rite while

992. Namely, an "oblation."

993. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν..."

maintaining the rule of the fast, it having been decreed to eat only once towards evening, and we are sanctified by the prayers, and by the sight of the eyes together with the mind when beholding the Lord himself being held by the priest, being set forth for our atonement, and distributed to those worthy of his communion," *Answer to Question fifty-five of Gabriēl of Pentapolis*).[994] However, the Church's customs in the meantime changed towards being more negligent. No one can claim that the change was done for the better and for the stricter. However, the Church's practice remained unchanged in the ancient tradition, not out of conservatism and inflexible tactics, but because it aims for the same ideal and invites us to return to it when the conditions that brought about the use of "oikonomia" are overcome in any way and at any time. Thus, the Church still celebrates the Presanctified every Wednesday and Friday of Great Lent and invites to communion not only during Saturdays and Sundays but also in the middle of the week.

With the celebration of the Presanctified during the evening of Wednesday, in some manner, an "ἀναπαλαίωση," namely, a restoration of the ancient correct taxis, is attempted. I think that the term, "ἀναπαλαίωση," a secular technical term, is as expressive as the term, "ἐπινόηση" (device), of Saint Symeōn. We can find this term agreeable because it is in current usage. To make a proper restoration requires correct study, effort, and time, and costs much more than the building of a structure from scratch. What does this mean for the Presanctified of Wednesday? That the restoration of the ancient and correct taxis must be done with the exactness of the old correct prescriptions. And these are two: that the Presanctified is not a sacred spectacle, but an invitation to approach holy communion. However, it is a communion that is part of the framework and requirements of Great Lent's fasting. Otherwise, the effort for its restoration at the correct hour of its celebration has no meaning. Our Christians can best commune on Saturdays or Sundays. If they wish (and they must wish) to approach for holy communion during the evening Presanctified, they ought to integrate it within the framework of the Holy

994. PG 155:904a–904b.

Fast's struggles. The eucharistic fast that precedes holy communion is, as is well known, the complete abstention from food and drink, from supper or from midnight up until the hour of holy partaking. If anyone for reasons of health cannot do this, let the spiritual fathers treat it in a philanthropic manner. However, I would say that it would be preferable to recommend him or her to commune during the Saturday or Sunday Liturgy. Let the Presanctified, its goal and prerequisites, remain incorruptible. Otherwise, what is the point of the attempt for its restoration at the correct time since we will be moving from one "oikonomia" to another "oikonomia"?[995]

565

When pastoral needs require it, is the celebration of the Divine Liturgy possible during the afternoon or evening of Sundays, feast days, or other days of the year and with what prerequisites?

In the first place, the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is not connected to any of the individual times or periods of the twenty-four-hour day. It moves above or beyond them, in a manner within the timeless realm of the Kingdom of God, of which it is not only an image and a symbol, but a real and true presence. It is indicative that none of its prayers, in all the variations of the liturgical forms of the ecumene, prescribe a specific point of time for its celebration, neither in the prayers of the synaxis (of the antiphons, entrance, trisagion, gospel reading, ektenēs, catechumens, faithful) nor in the liturgical prayers themselves of the anaphora and the prayers before and after that surround it. This becomes more obvious if we compare the first series of prayers with the parallel prayers of other services and synaxes, such as the prayers of Lamp-lighting and Matins, the Hours, Compline, and the Midnight Office, as well as with the prayers of

995. In other words, the celebration during the morning by "oikonomia" may be eliminated by restoring the service to the evening. However, if fasting until the evening is viewed as too difficult, then, according to Phountoulēs, there would be the possibility of another exercise of "oikonomia" regarding preparations for receiving holy communion. Phountoulēs is questioning the value of replacing one exercise of oikonomia with another.

the ancient "asmatic" services of the Trithektē and the Pannychis. All these are related to specific time points of the twenty-four-hour day and are associated with soteriological events that occurred during them, while relating our respective entreaties to these times. Particularly characteristic is the case of the diaconal petitions, where in the services of Matins and Vespers the time of the celebration is clearly identified ("morning,"[996] – "evening,"[997] "the day"[998] – "the evening"[999]), while it is not identified in the Divine Liturgy ("Let us complete our prayer to the Lord").[1000] Likewise, while in the services of the Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours a specific reference is made to events that happened during them (visitation of the Holy Spirit, Crucifixion, death of the Lord), in the Divine Liturgy while mention of these events is done, they are not connected with the respective hours of the daily cycle. In the two-thousand-year history of the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, all possible variations regarding a time for celebration of the mystery are encountered. "Time is not imposed on the Divine Liturgy, but the Liturgy is imposed on time." After thorough research and study of the topic of the relation between the Divine Liturgy and time and after the necessary historical retrospection into the Church's tradition, Father Alikiviadēs Kalyvopoulos reaches this conclusion in his dissertation, *Time of celebration of the Divine Liturgy*, Thessaloniki 1982, p. 218.[1001]

---

996. "ἑωθινήν."
997. "ἑσπερινήν."
998. "τὴν ἡμέραν."
999. "τὴν ἑσπέραν."
1000. "Πληρώσωμεν τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ."
1001. Ἀλκιβιάδης Κ. Καλυβόπουλος, *Χρόνος Τελέσεως τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 37 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1982), 218. The Reverend Father Alkiviadis Calivas (Ἀλκιβιάδης Καλύβας), (1932–), is a widely published Professor Emeritus of Liturgics at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Brookline Massachusetts. He received his appointment to the faculty of the School of Theology in 1978 and retired in 2003. He has represented the Church in regional, national, and international ecumenical, bilateral, and pan-Orthodox commissions, consultations, and symposia. In addition, he has also served as president of Hellenic College, and dean of the School of Theology, (https://boston.goarch.org/about_us/clergy-directory/acalivas.html, accessed June 3, 2022).

However, already from the fourth century, the time for celebration of the Divine Liturgy stabilized on two basic time points, without different variations and possibilities ever ceasing to exist in places and at times, or even coexisting. The selections of the hour are not random, not for the theological meaning that was given after the fact to justify the preference of these hours, but because they express a venerable tradition of centuries, which is born of the Church's experience as well as its spiritual and practical wisdom. For this reason, not only is the taxis that gradually solidified not a result of arbitrary choice, but it is an expression of faith and for this reason is connected to the whole system of the faithful's ecclesiastical life in Christ. As a spiritual trapeza, the celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, and the communion self-evidently connected with it, remained connected with the material trapeza, just as during the Mystical Supper and during the first Christians' eucharistic synaxes. The difference lies in the fact that for reasons of piety the spiritual food and drink precede the material and this second trapeza is no longer common, such as in the "agapes" of the early church, nor is it provided in the temple, but in our private homes. Likewise for reasons of piety, the celebration of the Holy Eucharist and consequently also communion during it, already from the fourth century if not even earlier, had as a prerequisite the so-called "eucharistic fast," namely, the full abstention from food and drink, from supper or from midnight of the previous day. "That the holy elements of the altar shall not be performed except by fasting men" (canon forty-eight of Carthage and twenty-nine of Penthektē).[1002] According to this taxis, when it is a fasting day and there is one trapeza, the Divine Liturgy is celebrated prior to it, namely, after the ninth hour of the day (3:00 p.m. with our modern time).[1003] When it is a festal day, or in any case not fasting, then the Divine Liturgy is celebrated

1002. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:405 (also listed as canon forty-one); Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:367.

1003. On fasting days, the practice was to eat only once. The expression "κάνω ἐνάτη" (I do the ninth [hour]) refers to this practice of eating once a day after the ninth hour on fasting days. In monasteries in Greece and on Mount Athos, typically trapeza, namely, supper, occurs following Vespers right after the ninth hour, even on days when there is more than one meal.

prior to the meal, namely, between the third and sixth hour of the day (approximately 9:00 a.m. up until 12:00 noon, according to our time). The third to the sixth hour of the day finally was established as the most convenient time for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and was theologically justified as the only appropriate one since its celebration presupposes the descent of the Holy Spirit at the third hour on the day of Pentecost. Certainly, later Byzantine texts criticize the Latins because they celebrated prior to the third hour "from the early morning...and not at the hour that has been held to be of the Holy Spirit's descent."[1004] Nevertheless, the monastic Typikon of Saint Sabas provides for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy even earlier than the third hour, when a vigil precedes, "owing to the fatigue of the vigil," on Sundays and on great feasts.[1005] Thus, the time for the eucharistic fast also contracts, becoming greater on fasting days, briefer on days of feasts that have a vigil, and intermediate on the remaining non-festal days of the year. This is a very wisely organized system, according to which the time for celebration of the Divine Liturgy and communion during it and the length of the eucharistic fast are coordinated with the theme of the day and its festal, non-festal, or mourning character.

1004. Kyrillos of Kyzikos (Kōnstantinos Stilbēs), *The errors of the Latin church as far as concerning dogmas, Scriptures, and many other matters* (*Τὰ αἰτιάματα τῆς λατινικῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅσα περὶ δογμάτων καὶ γραφῶν καὶ ἑτέρων πολλῶν συγγραφέντα παρὰ Κυρίλλου τοῦ πρὶν Κυζίκου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Στιλβῆ*), 2. As far as also such matters concern divine rites (Ὅσα περὶ θείας τελετὰς καὶ τοιαῦτα). 16, in Jean Darrouzès, "Le mémoire de Constantine Stilbès contre les Latins," *Revue des Études Byzantines* 21 (1963): 65. Compare the translation in Tia M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: The Errors of the Latins* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 199. Kyrillos of Kyzikos (Kōnstantinos Stilbēs) (*Κωνσταντῖνος Στιλβῆς*), a professor who held the three most honored patriarchal teaching posts at Constantinople in the late twelfth century and became metropolitan of Kyzikos under the name of Kyrillos, most likely witnessed the conquest of the Byzantine capital under the Fourth Crusade (1204) and wrote a polemical text that contained one of the longest surviving lists enumerating the errors of the Latins. In addition to Kolbaba's and Darrouzès's studies, see also Michael Angold, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context* (London: Routledge, 2003) 201–202.

1005. This practice is followed nowadays in monasteries in Greece, including Mount Athos. Regarding the ninth hour and adjustment of time occurring seasonally in the monasteries, see question 535.

Unlike the feast days, during which we have an abbreviation of the eucharistic fast, the eucharistic fast is lengthened on fasting days. Thus, during the weekdays of Great Lent, holy communion is no longer associated with the liturgical end of the fasting day, namely, the service of the Ninth Hour, but with the first service of the next day, the service of Vespers. After this, the only trapeza of the day follows, supper. On days of even stricter fasting, such as the eve of Pascha (Great Saturday), the eve of the Nativity, and the eve of Theophany, if they do not coincide with Saturday or Sunday, then the connection of Liturgy/communion and Vespers remains, but this Vespers is joined to the service of the vigil, as its first part. Thus, the Liturgy concludes, according to the clear rubrics of the Typika, the second hour of the night, namely, at 9–10 p.m. This also means a corresponding extension of the eucharistic fast.

This whole wondrous and precise system was disrupted in difficult times, which had serious consequences both on the liturgical customs of Christians and partially also of the monastics themselves. In the preceding answer, we saw that the Presanctified of Great Lent's fasting days was transferred to the morning and how its eucharistic fast had been equated with feast days.[1006] The same thing also happened with the evening synaxes, the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, and communion during Great Saturday and during the eves of the Nativity and Theophany.[1007] During Sundays, the joining of the Divine Liturgy with the service of Matins caused the acceleration of its celebration prior to the traditional third hour. The reason is obvious. The holding of two separate synaxes, one for the Matins during the last hours of the night,[1008] and a second one for the Divine Liturgy after the third hour of the day, was not helpful to the people nor also was it desirable nor also was it possible. Matins and Liturgy essentially constituted one service, which was celebrated,

1006. In other words, the duration of the eucharistic fast on feast days contracts and becomes shorter.

1007. In other words, these celebrations were moved earlier, to the mornings, and the eucharistic fast correspondingly became shorter.

1008. The word, "Ὄρθρος," used in Greek and normally translated as "Matins," means "early dawn" just before daybreak.

and continues to be celebrated in our regions[1009] up until nowadays, during the first hours of the day. The Slavic churches followed another practice more consistent with the old tradition and the monastic taxis and more suitable for the peculiarities of the northern climates. The monasteries if they did not always maintain the old practice, also themselves accelerated the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, even the Presanctified, but preserved the liturgical form, and prior to the Divine Liturgy, read the services of the Third and Sixth Hours. The form sometimes recalls what needs to be done. In general, it is characteristic that in all the above changes implemented for the various difficulties of the times and by oikonomia, the ancient relationship between the eucharistic fast and Liturgy remained (even if quite abbreviated) especially during fasting days.[1010]

For several decades now, especially in large cities, a change as to the time for celebration of the Divine Liturgy has been attempted in practice, the importance and extent of which has perhaps not been properly assessed. It is something analogous and parallel to the restoration of the Presanctified of Wednesday to its old and correct evening celebration, concerning which there was a discussion in the preceding answer. The initiatives were taken by clergy with strong pastoral interests and a sense of the new living conditions, especially of young people, who are not accommodated by what are considered and what prevails as traditional hours of worship, especially during feast days. It is well known that, not only all the commemorations of the celebrated great saints, but also many of the great feasts of the Lord and the Mother of God (the foremost of which are constantly not celebrated on a Sunday), are working days. For us to remain only on the feasts of the Lord and the Mother of God, during the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the Entrance, the Meeting of Christ, the leavetaking of Pascha, the Ascension of the Lord, and the Transfiguration, while perhaps our churches are filled in the crowded parishes of the large cities and the illusion of "all is well"[1011] is created for us, in reality the congregation consists

1009. Greece.

1010. See question sixty on the eucharistic fast in general.

1011. "καλὰ λίαν."

of people of the so-called third age,[1012] namely, those who are not working. The impossibility of young people's participation in these festal synaxes is something particularly serious for the present, and in the long term full of obvious risks for the future of these feasts. The same thing is also true for the feasts of saints, and even to a partial degree for the Sunday synaxes.

The solution existed and was correctly sought in the direction and according to the model of the monastic practice of the vigils. The monastic tradition always influenced the parish practice, but nowadays influences it even more due to the flowering of the monastic life during our era. Moreover, the hours of night worship were and are dear to monks and pious Christians, and the new living conditions made them even more helpful and convenient for young people, at least more so than the early morning hours of the traditional parish synaxes. Thus, within reasonable limits for the living conditions of the working faithful of the cities, "small vigils"[1013] are celebrated during the eves of feasts (or even unrelated to them), with the provision that the celebration of the mystery of Holy Eucharist always in point of time falls on the new day, namely, from midnight onwards, but also provides the necessary rest time after the end of the whole service to the faithful participating in it.

In this way, namely, during the celebration of "small vigils," the eucharistic fast is not affected nor is the approach of the faithful to holy communion hindered. On the contrary, according to the model of the Paschal vigil and communion, even with the application by analogy of the pertinent rubric of the Typikon of Saint Sabas concerning acceleration of the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, "owing to the fatigue of the vigil," it is made considerably convenient.

Conversely, the other solution suggested and promoted by some, of a complete Liturgy in the afternoon or early evening hours, while it can be helpful and does not contradict the Divine Liturgy's char-

1012. "τρίτης ήλικίας," an expression meaning the elderly or senior citizens.

1013. "μικρὲς ἀγρυπνίες." These are also referred to as "μεσονυκτικὲς ἀγρυπνίες," "μεσονυκτικὲς ἀκολουθίες," or "μεσονυκτικὲς λειτουργίες." They typically end between 1:00 and 2:00 a.m. These are different from all-night services or vigils, which end at 5:00 or 6:00 a.m. and follow the monastic tradition more closely.

acter unbound by time, clearly conflicts with and overturns the most ancient traditions concerning eucharistic fasting. For every celebration of the Divine Liturgy and participation in the Mysteries, the legislation that they are celebrated "by fasting men"[1014] mandatorily applies. In this regard, particularly enlightening is canon forty-eight of the Council of Carthage of Africa,[1015] where in order for the funeral of Christians, even of bishops, who died "during the afternoon"[1016] and who ought to be immediately interred due to the warmth of the climate, the mystery of the Holy Eucharist must not be celebrated, as the taxis required, but the funeral must take place "with prayers alone,"[1017] if those participating and about to celebrate it "might be found having eaten."[1018] The eucharistic fast was completely in force, and is also in force nowadays. And a celebration of a Liturgy without a participation of the celebrants in it through holy communion, as well as by the power and discretion of the people, is completely inconceivable.

Certainly, two possibilities are put forward for circumvention of this obstacle: First, to set a time limit for fasting based on medical-physiological data, which will predetermine the time of food intake before the Divine Liturgy/communion so that people are "fasting," namely, with an empty stomach during it. Second, to apply the traditional rule of not eating from midnight for those who choose to commune, no matter how ponderous this provision might also seem. Both solutions are in principle unacceptable. As to the first, something analogous in the Western Church has been attempted, which, while motivated from a good intention, namely, the facilitation of clergy and laity for the celebration of evening Liturgies and approaching communion, concluded in the abolition of

1014. "ὑπὸ νηστικῶν ἀνθρώπων."

1015. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:405–406.

1016. "κατὰ τὸν δειλινὸν καιρόν." Compare also Sophoclēs who defines "τὸ δειλινόν" as "the afternoon meal" (Sophocles, s.v., "δειλινός, ή, όν, (δείλη)"). If taken in this sense, the concern of the canon would be regarding those who have eaten the afternoon meal and then would be called upon to celebrate the Holy Eucharist in connection with the funeral, which due to climatic conditions cannot be delayed until the next day.

1017. "μόναις εὐχαῖς."

1018. "ἀριστήσαντες εὑρεθῶσι."

the eucharistic fast. Defining types of food and drink, special cases for children, elderly, or sick and travelers and the commensurate time of digestion for the Liturgy on the basis of medical data, are things pedantic and alien to the spirit and tradition of the Orthodox Church and to the spirit and letter of the eucharistic fast. I think it is without doubt that it would very quickly lead to the corruption of the taxis and to undesirable and anti-traditional deviations.

And second, perhaps even more importantly. The extension of fasting to non-fasting days is prohibited by the very tradition and taxis of the Church. If the Divine Liturgy is celebrated during the afternoons or during the hours prior to midnight of Sundays and feasts, and a complete eucharistic fast is observed during them, the joyous days are changed into mournful and penitential days, not of the Bridegroom's presence, but of expectation and preparation. This precisely is the spirit of the eucharistic fast, but the expediting of the hour for the celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist and of communion during it on the days of great feasts, the delay during the non-festal days, and the even greater extension of the eucharistic fast during the fasting days, precisely express this, and not the physiological functioning of our digestive system. In some manner, this is self-evident. "And God will destroy both this [the belly] and these [the foods]" (1 Corinthians 6:13).

The writer is neither in a position nor even competent to weigh whether the pastoral reasons that are put forward for justification of evening Liturgies are so valid and the needs unavoidable for their celebration. Perhaps also for this reason, the writer devalues them, thinking that they are not justified in our known region.[1019] Perhaps the issue takes on other dimensions and requires a different approach in other places where living conditions are different, and coexistence with people of other faiths and beliefs imposes the discovery of similar solutions. However, in any case, this is a very serious subject that needs to be addressed in a timely and serious manner by the competent ecclesiastical persons, after careful study of the tradition and the special pastoral conditions and requirements of each region.

1019. Greece.

I will only allow myself to insist on the seriousness and urgency of the matter. To conclude humbly, I note, always in my personal judgment, that pastoral needs are not such as to justify the abolition or, to a lesser extent, the changing of one of the Church's practices that has existed for many centuries, with the introduction of a complete evening Liturgy on days of non-fasting, but antithetically on festal ones.[1020] The needs of the faithful are adequately remedied by Divine Liturgies on the days of rest, the Saturdays and Sundays, and indeed with the so-called "small vigils" during the eves of great feasts, or even exceptionally, always under the condition that they do not function, in some manner, in competition with the great synaxis of the people of God and divine worship on the day of the Lord.

566

Criteria for selection of the gospel pericope for the commemoration of Saint Mamas (September 2), of the epistle pericope for the commemoration of the Holy Notaries Markianos and Martyrios (October 25), and of the gospel pericope for the Holy Martyrs Gourias, Samōnas, and Abibos (November 15).

In the answer to question 449, which concerned the relationship of the epistle and gospel pericopes to the commemorations of certain saints and the criteria for their selection, we could not find a satisfactory answer, nevertheless, for the three instances above. The gospel pericope John 10:1–11 is provided during the commemoration of Saint Mamas, the epistle pericope Colossians 3:4–11 for the commemoration of the Holy Notaries, and the gospel pericope Luke 20:46–47, 21:1–4 for the commemoration of the Holy Martyrs Gourias, Samōnas, and Abibos. We owe many thanks to the professor of the Law School of the Democritus University of Thrace, Kōnstantinos Pitsakēs,[1021] who in his recent letter makes us sharers

1020. "ἀλλ' ἀντιθέτως" (but antithetically). In other words, the celebration of such complete evening Liturgies on feasts contradicts the whole notion of a festal day because of the preparatory fasting prior to the evening Liturgy on a day when no fasting is supposed to take place.

1021. Κωνσταντίνος Πιτσάκης (1944–2012) was a professor of legal history on the faculty of law of the Democritus University of Thrace and the author of

of his correct views and hypotheses, which resolve in an absolutely satisfactory manner this triple question. We quote below the pertinent excerpt from his letter, while warmly expressing thanks for his advice:

1. Saint Mamas, "who was saved under a cave,"[1022] and "who was fed by the milk of deer,"[1023] a friend of animals and wild beasts, which he tamed (the references are frequent in his hymnography),[1024] a protector of shepherds in popular tradition, is also represented nowadays "holding a small deer and a pastoral staff"[1025] according to Phōtēs Kontoglou[1026] of eternal memory, and is hymned as a "shepherd"[1027]: "By the staff, which was given to you by God, shepherd your people on life-giving pastures"[1028] (kontakion), "who freshly milked the deer in the wilderness, and now tends and guides well the chosen people of the Lord, by a staff of power, to a place of verdure…"[1029] (oikos). Consequently, the pericope for the good shepherd, whose voice the

---

definitive works in the field of canon law including historical studies, books, and an edition of the *Hexabiblos* of fourteenth century jurist Kōnstantinos Harmenopoulos (Κωνσταντῖνος Ἁρμενόπουλος).

1022. "περισωθεὶς ὑπό τι σπήλαιον."

1023. "τρεφόμενος τῷ τῶν ἐλάφων γάλακτι."

1024. The two quoted texts appear to be based on the Synaxarion commonly found in the Mēnaia for September 2, where the Saint is described in the following: "καὶ περισωθεὶς τοῦ κινδύνου θείᾳ δυνάμει, ὑπό τι σπήλαιον κρύπτεται, τρεφόμενος τῷ τῶν ἐλάφων γάλακτι." See Μηναῖον τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1959), 18.

1025. Φώτιος Κόντογλου, Ἔκφρασις (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀστήρ, 1960), 1:321.

1026. Φώτιος Κόντογλου (1895–1965), a theologian, iconographer, chanter, and artist, who is recognized as one of the major figures of Orthodoxy in the twentieth century and is credited with significantly contributing to the revival of traditional iconography in Greece. For a brief biography and discussion of his contributions, see Archimandrite Patapios, Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Etna, and Monk Chrysostomos, *Two Modern Titans of Mind and Spirit: The Private Correspondence of Constantine Cavarnos and Photios Kontoglou (1952–1965)* (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2014). Phōtēs (Φώτης) is the vernacular form of the name Phōtios (Φώτιος).

1027. "ποιμήν."

1028. "Ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ Ἅγιε, τῇ ἐκ Θεοῦ σοι δοθήσῃ, τὸν λαόν σου ποίμανον, ἐπὶ νομὰς ζωηφόρους…"

1029. "τὸν πρὶν τὰς ἐλάφους ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καινῶς ἀμέλγοντα καὶ νῦν περιούσιον λαὸν Κυρίου, ῥαβδῳ δυνάμεως, καλῶς περιέποντα καὶ ὁδηγοῦντα εἰς τόπον χλόης…"

sheep hear and who "calls his own sheep by name,"[1030] was "by necessity" selected for the good shepherd/saint.[1031]

2. The martyrs Markianos and Martyrios are the "Holy Notaries,"[1032] on the feast of which in Constantinople the famous "pagan" festival took place, concerning which there is the well-known poem of Christophoros Mytylēnaios and various references concerning popular rites performed during it.[1033] The Church repeatedly condemned these practices: "Indeed the unseemly things taking place among the notary teachers of boys during the feast of the Holy Notaries, who go through the market-place with theatrical masks, some years before were condemned by a decree of that most holy patriarch Lord Loukas" (Balsamōn).[1034] "For I think what takes place among

1030. John 10:3.

1031. On Saint Mamas in general, see Nikolaos M. Bonovas, Agathoniki Tsilipakou, and Christodoulos A. Hadjichristodoulou, eds., *The Veneration of Saint Mamas in the Mediterranean: A Traveler, Border Defender Saint, Ἡ τιμὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Μάμαντος στὴ Μεσόγειο: Ἕνας ἀκρίτας ἅγιος ταξιδεύει* (Thessaloniki: Museum of Byzantine Culture, 2013).

1032. "ἅγιοι Νοτάριοι."

1033. The pagan festival is the feast of Dionysos, the Broumalia. On the feast in Byzantium, see Fritz Graf, *Roman Festivals in the Greek East: From the Early Empire to the Middle Byzantine Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015): 201–218, J.R. Crawford, "De Bruma et brumalibus festis," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 23 (1914/19): 365–396, and Elena Nonveiller, "The Broumalia festival from Rome to Byzantium: continuity or ideological reinvention?" *Diogenes* 9 (2020): 5–16. Christophoros Mytilēnaios (Χριστόφορος Μυτιληναῖος) (Mytilēnaios, a family name, and not indicative of his personal origins) was born ca. 1000 in Constantinople and held positions in the Byzantine imperial bureaucracy as a patrikios, a prōtospatharios, and a judge in the Byzantine capital as well as in the provinces. His poem numbered 115 discusses this pagan festival, which still survived in the capital during his time, and the custom of sending cakes. His poem 136 describes the processions and other displays during the feast of the Holy Notaries. A brief biography and the poems can be found respectively in Floris Bernard and Christopher Livanos, eds. and trans., *The Poems of Christopher of Mytilene and John Mauropous*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 50 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), x–xi, 253, 286–303.

1034. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:451–452. The patriarch referenced is Loukas Chrysobergēs (Λουκᾶς Χρυσοβέργης), whose reign is dated 1157–1170. Theodōros Balsamōn lived in the last half of the twelfth century. He was a deacon of the Great Church of Saint Sophia in Constantinople, chartophylax, nomophylax, prōtos of the Monastery of Blachernai, and patriarch of Antioch.

the notaries in the procession of the Holy Notaries is prohibited by this" (Balsamōn).[1035] Therefore, I would say that the pericope, which condemns the works of the "idolatry, on account of which God's wrath is coming upon the sons of disobedience, in which you also once walked,"[1036] as well as every "slander and obscene speech,"[1037] and calls upon the faithful to put off "the old humanity with its practices, and having put on the new one which is being renewed in knowledge...,"[1038] perhaps has an didactic role: It does not refer to the honored saints, but condemns the practice that has been connected with their commemoration and calls upon the people reject it.

3. While it is impossible for the pericope Luke 20:46–47, 21:1–4, for Saints Gourias, Samōnas, and Abibos, to be associated with the life of the saints, as it has been included in the Synaxarion, some connection can be found with that famous miracle of the saints, with that poor widowed mother's daughter, who falls into the hands of the evil Goth and so forth.[1039] The theme is dominant in the feast's

---

Balsamōn was given an imperial and patriarchal mandate under Emperor Manouēl I Komnēnos (r. 1143–1180) and Ecumenical Patriarch Michaēl III (r. 1170–1178) to produce commentaries on the *Nomokanōn in 14 Titles* and the late Byzantine church's received corpus of formal canonical legislation belonging to the latter work. Other canonical works, including the authorship of formal decisions of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, are attributed to Balsamōn. For additional information, see Patrick Viscuso, *Guide for a Church under Islam: The Sixty-Six Canonical Questions Attributed to Theodōros Balsamōn* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2014).

1035. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:471, n. 1.

1036. 1 Colossians 3:5–7.

1037. 1 Colossians 3:8.

1038. 1 Colossians 3:9–10.

1039. According to the narrative, a Goth took Euphemia, the daughter of a poor widow in Edessa, as a wife under false pretenses since he was already married. The Goth made a false oath on the graves of Saints Gourias, Samōnas, and Abibos. Upon returning to his land, the Goth made Euphemia a slave. She gave birth to a son who was poisoned by the Goth's wife. Euphemia was threatened with death by being buried alive and called upon the help of the saints, who miraculously delivered her from harm. For a discussion of the miracle and examination of its elements, see Charis Messis and Stratis Papaioannou, "Histoires 'gothiques' à Byzance: Le saint, le soldat et le Miracle d'Euphémie et du Goth," *DOP* 67 (2013): 15–47. When transliterated from the Syriac, these Edessan martyrs commonly appear as "Guria," "Shmona," and "Habib."

hymnography, parallel with the martyrdom of the saints (see, "they saved a girl who while living had been thrown into a tomb,"[1040] "when the girl, who was unjustly delivered up to burial, you conducted safely into her mother's arms,"[1041] "for outrunning death they rescued the girl who cried out, whom her mother entrusted to the martyrs while crying out,"[1042] "through you a tyrannized girl…is restored to the one who nurtured her,"[1043] and so forth). Certainly, in the texts of the hymn of Pseudo-Rōmanos[1044] and hagiology, the presence of the mother is more conspicuous. Therefore, I think that the double theme of the pericope—of the powerful who ruin the houses of widows ("who devour the houses of widows"),[1045] while "under a pretense they make long prayers"[1046] (the Goth had prayed over the bodies of the martyrs, whom he had made guarantors of his special intentions regarding the daughter of the woman), and who will receive "greater condemnation"[1047] (the Goth in question "paid the penalty for the most reckless inhumanity…by righteous judgment"[1048]) and of the pious poor widow, the "needy one,"[1049] who is justified—would have been deemed to suit that theme of the feast.

For a discussion of these martyrs in their Syriac context, see Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "The Edessan Martyrs and Ascetic Tradition," OCA 236 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 195–206.

1040. Doxastikon of Vespers, November 15.

1041. First stichēron of Vespers, November 15.

1042. Oikos of Matins, November 15.

1043. Second stichēron of the sixth ode of Matins, November 15.

1044. For a discussion of Pseudo-Rōmanos, see José Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origins de la poésie religieuse à Byzantine* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977), 217–242. The hymns to the three martyrs, which are not considered the authentic work of Rōmanos the Melodist, are listed in Paul Maas and C.A. Trypanis, eds., *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica Dubia* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyer and Co., 1970), 115–120.

1045. Luke 20:47.

1046. Luke 20:47.

1047. Luke 20:47.

1048. Third stichēron of the seventh ode of Matins, November 15.

1049. "τῆς πενιχρᾶς," Luke 21:2.

567

Must the prayer behind the ambōn be said by the priest toward the icon of Christ or toward the holy bēma (toward the East)?

568

How must "Let us give thanks to the Lord"[1050] prior to the prayer of the anaphora be said, toward the icon of Christ, toward the East, or toward the people?[1051]

These two parallel questions have this in common: In contemporary practice both the prayer behind the ambōn as well as "Let us give thanks to the Lord" are said while the priest is found at the beautiful gate and turns sideways toward the icon of Christ or even bows toward it during "Let us give thanks to the Lord." The modern Hieratika also prescribe this posture of the priest during the recitation of the prayer behind the ambōn: "which [prayer] the priest says in an exclamatory manner toward the icon of Christ of the templon" or "and standing in front of [or before] the icon of Christ [or the icon of the templon]" (edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia, 1968 and 1977).[1052] Regarding, "Let us give thanks to the Lord," agreement does not exist in the modern printed editions: "turning toward the East" (1968) or in a more detailed manner "crossing his hands on his chest he bows before the icon of Christ the Lord" (1977). In old, printed editions, as well as in the manuscripts, the priest's posture is not prescribed. That which is commonly attested to by the com-

1050. "Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ."

1051. For a recent study of the prayer behind the ambōn, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. V, The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 592–698.

1052. The phrases "πρὸς τῆς δεσποτικῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ" (toward the icon of Christ of the templon) and "τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [ἡ τῆς δεσποτικῆς εἰκόνος]" (the icon of Christ [or the icon of the templon]) reflect the use of word "δεσποτικός" as a technical term to indicate an icon placed on the templon or iconostasis. See Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek, s.v. "δεσποτικός[2]," https://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/search.html?page=23&lq=δε, accessed August 24, 2022. An identical use of the term occurs in question 286.

mentator Fathers of the Divine Liturgy and by the standard rubrics is that the prayer behind the ambōn was said "outside of the bēma" and "within earshot" of the people. The title of the prayer ("behind the ambōn")[1053] attests to the place where it was read. It presupposes the old arrangement of the temple and the ambōn in the middle of the central nave, just as we find it in the excavations of the early Christian basilicas and just as we encounter it in the temple of the Dormition of the Theotokos of Kalampaka, the old Metropolis.[1054] "In front"[1055] of the ambōn is the area between an ambōn and a beautiful gate; "behind,"[1056] the area between an ambōn and royal gates, namely, toward the West, which is found almost at the mid-point of the axis that runs between the sanctuary and the external gate. An icon of Christ was not found there for the priest to be turning toward it during the time of the prayer's recitation. If we take under consideration that the prayer behind the ambōn is a dismissal prayer for blessing the people (see, "and bless your inheritance")[1057] in a period where the third dismissal layer ("May the blessing of the Lord… May Christ our true")[1058] had not yet developed, namely, the modern dismissal, then we understand why it was said in the middle of both the temple and the people "behind"[1059] the ambōn. And up until nowadays, the modern dismissal of the Holy Mountain is said in the middle of the temple, beneath the central chandelier. Thus, we must imagine the priest standing during the recitation of the prayer behind the ambōn and looking toward the West, namely, toward

1053. "ὀπισθάμβωνος."

1054. For a discussion of this temple, see Vassiliki Sythiakakis–Kritsimallis and Sotiris Voyadjis, "Redating the Basilica of Dormition, Kalampaka, Thessaly," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011): 195–227. The authors of the latter study conclude that the marble furnishings of the temple are from the period around 1100. Compare also the older study of Γ. Α. Σωτηρίου, "Βυζαντινὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Θεσσαλίας ΙΓ' καὶ ΙΔ' αἰῶνος – Ἡ Βασιλικὴ τῆς Κοιμήσεως τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐν Καλαμπάκᾳ," *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 6 (1929): 290–315.

1055. "ἔμπροσθεν."

1056. "ὄπισθεν."

1057. "καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου."

1058. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου… Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός."

1059. "ὄπισθεν."

the people, who were before and around him. The prayer behind the ambōn does not belong to the original text of the Liturgies because it is well known that during the period of their authorship the Liturgy ended with "Let us go forth in peace."[1060] However, it must be quite old, as its title at least attests to, which brings us back to the times before the transfer of the ambōn from the middle of the temple to the left side. With the transfer of the ambōn, the prayer lost the original place of its recitation; with the addition of the new dismissal ("May Christ our true…"), it also lost its dismissal character. In any case, blessing during "and bless your inheritance," which was the dismissal blessing during the interim where the prayer behind the ambōn was the final prayer, was preserved by the old-time priests, and perhaps is still preserved in some places.

We said that the prayer behind the ambōn, according to the modern standard rubrics of the Hieratika, is read by the priest turned sideways toward the icon of Christ, which is found on the right of the templon. The old-time priests did so traditionally, and the modern standard rubrics record this taxis. At least as far as I know, the dispute is recent as to whether this posture of the priest and the recitation of the prayer is toward the icon of Christ. The reason is theological, namely, that the prayer is not addressed to the Son, but toward God the Father or toward the Holy Trinity. Consequently, the priest wrongly turns toward the icon of Christ. The objection is not without a basis, although one could recall the saying of Christ, "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9) and the analogous imagery of sacred iconography, where Christ is depicted in the theophanies of the Old Testament (compare, "He who of old spoke with Moses on Mount Sinai by symbols, saying, 'I am who I am,' who was today transfigured on Mount Tabor…,"[1061] idiomelon of the first tone of the aposticha for Vespers, August 6, and others).

1060. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

1061. "Ὁ πάλαι τῷ Μωσεῖ συλλαλήσας ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους Σινᾶ διὰ συμβόλων Ἐγώ εἰμι, λέγων, ὁ Ὢν' σήμερον ἐπ' ὄρους Θαβὼρ μεταμορφωθείς…."

As it is well known, nowadays we have three prayers behind the ambōn in use: "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you...,"[1062] "O Christ our God, who accepts from those who call upon you with all their heart this rational and bloodless sacrifice as a sacrifice of praise and well-pleasing worship...,"[1063] and "O Master Pantokratōr, who fashioned all creation in wisdom...."[1064] All three are equally ancient and are encountered in the *Codex Barberini 336* from the eighth century, the most ancient Byzantine Euchologion. The first is used in the Divine Liturgy of the Sacred Chrysostomos, the second in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great (and wrongly its use in modern Hieratika is confined only to January 1), and the third in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts during Great Lent (to the themes of which there exists a clear reference). The first and third are addressed, as most prayers of the Divine Liturgy, to God the Father, even if this is not completely apparent. However, it is inferred from the addition of "you"[1065] in the biblical reference (James [Iakōvos] 1:17: "from you the Father of lights"[1066]) and in the trinitarian conclusion of both ("to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit" – "of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit").[1067] Conversely, the second prayer ("O Christ our God, who accepts from those...") is unambiguously addressed to Christ, as indicated by its entire content and

1062. "Ὁ εὐλογῶν τοὺς εὐλογοῦντας σε, Κύριε...," Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 21.3.

1063. "Ὁ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ λατρείαν εὐάρεστον, τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν προσδεχόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων σε ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν...," Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 284.2. In the latter edition, "Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν," is missing.

1064. "Δέσποτα παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν ἐν σοφίᾳ δημιουργήσας...," Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 281.2.

1065. "σοῦ."

1066. "ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων."

1067. "τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι – τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

its doxological conclusion. In the present form of our Liturgies, we also have other prayers that are addressed to the second person of the Holy Trinity (the prayer prior to the gospel reading, the prayer of the cheroubikon, "Hearken, O Lord...,"[1068] the prayer "in consuming the Holy Elements"[1069] of Chrysostomos, and perhaps the prayer of the third antiphon, despite its trinitarian exclamation). These are also equally ancient as the remaining ones, but they originate from another liturgical tradition, and two, "No one is worthy..."[1070] and "Hearken, O Lord...," possibly are a loan from the Liturgy of Alexandria that bears the name of Saint Grēgorios the Theologian. These things are written in order that the importance and position of the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts from those...," not be underestimated, which from a philological and theological point of view is faultless and wondrous. Perhaps this also constitutes the solution of the enigma as to why the prayers behind the ambōn are said by the priest while turned to the icon of Christ. Obviously after the moving or suppression of the ambōn, the more natural position of the priest during the recitation of a prayer that is said outside of the bēma and addressed to Christ was to be turned toward the icon of the Lord on the templon. If we take under consideration that the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, with which this prayer was connected, was celebrated every Sunday and on every principal feast, we can understand the priest's turning as more out of habit toward the icon of Christ in the two other Liturgies as well. In any case, this is not conclusive. Other prayers that are addressed to God the Father are also said toward the icon of Christ, such as the prayers of Lamplighting and Matins, when they are said outside of the bēma. Our contemporary concerns in relation to the tradition as it is expressed by the practice of our worship must rather be viewed as pedantic.

But the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts from those...," is not the only one of the prayers behind the ambōn that are addressed to Christ. It is well known that apart from the three that are nowadays in use, at least eighty have been brought to light (not only

1068. "Πρόσχες Κύριε..."
1069. "ἐν τῷ συστεῖλαι τὰ ἅγια."
1070. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."

relatively modern ones but also older ones) that are even encountered in the most ancient Byzantine Euchologion, which we referenced. They are chiefly encountered in Italo-Greek manuscripts, but not only in them. Of these almost one third are addressed to God the Father. Two to the people, as a type of sermon, address, or blessing. One to the Panagia. However, the vast majority, almost two thirds, are addressed to the second person of the Holy Trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ. This clearly explains not only the priest's turn toward the icon of Christ during their recitation, but also the prevalence of this posture during the recitation of all the rest of the prayers behind the ambōn. Or even if these prayers are considered somewhat later, the fact that since the priest's posture by tradition during the recitation of the prayer behind the ambōn was toward the icon of Christ, the new prayers were overwhelmingly written in this form, namely, addressed to Christ. Thus, despite perhaps our theological reservations, it appears that after the change of the ambōn's position this was the priest's posture by tradition; that toward the icon of Christ.

At this point, the answer to the second question is differentiated. "Let us give thanks to the Lord" is not addressed either to God the Father or to Christ. Consequently, we cannot invoke, in some manner, dogmatic reasons to justify its recitation toward the icon of Christ, but neither also toward the East, namely, toward the holy table. Without a possible objection, it is an exhortation to the worshipping congregation, toward the people who are present during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, something analogous to "Let us love one another"[1071] or "Let us bow our heads to the Lord."[1072] The response of the people, "It is proper and right,"[1073] and the beginning of the priestly prayer, the prayer of the holy anaphora, "It is proper and right to hymn you…"[1074] of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos or "O Master, He who is, Lord God…"[1075] of Basileios the Great[1076]

1071. "Ἀγαπήσωμεν ἀλλήλους."
1072. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."
1073. "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον."
1074. "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν…"
1075. "Ὁ ὢν Δέσποτα, Κύριε Θεέ…"
1076. The attribution to the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is missing from the text. It was added here for clarity.

precisely indicate that the beginning of the eucharistic prayer according to the models of Judaic practice is structured in the form of a dialogue between celebrant and people. Accordingly, if we wished based on theological criteria to identify the position of the priest during the time of the recitation of "Let us give thanks to the Lord," it ought to be not toward the holy table, but toward the people. Thus, the traditional posture is probably justified, with the understanding that after "Let us give thanks to the Lord," which is said toward the people, the priest bows to the icon of Christ of the templon while returning to the holy table, "he makes an inclination"[1077] toward it, according to the customary liturgical expression.

569

When the ektenēs is said after the gospel reading, can we add names of living and those who have fallen asleep, as old-time priests did?

In connection with the commemoration of names during the great entrance, we had noted the Divine Liturgy's great ektenēs[1078] after the gospel reading as a time for the normal commemoration of names of those living and dead.[1079] The commemoration of names during the great entrance is proper to the hierarchical Liturgy, which as is well known preserved the older taxis, according to which the proskomidē, consequently also the commemoration of names, was

1077. "κάνει σχῆμα."

1078. "μεγάλη ἐκτενή."

1079. See question 558, but compare 11, 70, 231, and 292. For scholarship dealing with the ektenēs, see Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine: Étude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971), 148–156; the recent translation and updating of the latter work, Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 237–244; Stefano Parenti, "L'*Ektenê* della Liturgia di Crisostomo nell' Eucologio St. Petersburg gr. 226 (X Secolo)," in *ΕΥΛΟΓΗΜΑ: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, S.J.*, ed. Ephrem Carr, Stefano Parenti, Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, Elena Velkovska, Studia Anselmaniana 110, Analecta Liturgica 17 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993), 295–318; and Stefanos Alexopoulos, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of Its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Units*, Liturgia Condenda 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 197–202.

done during the cheroubikon, namely, prior to the beginning of the eucharistic part of the synaxis, the celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. From this its original and natural place, the proskomidē was first transferred during the chanting of the antiphons, later prior to the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, either during the reading of the Third and Sixth Hours in the monasteries, or during the service of Matins in the parishes. The transfer took place to gain time and for the proskomidē to be more comfortably done, which already began to expand into quite a developed service, a type of "anticipation"[1080] of the Divine Liturgy.[1081] However, the hierarchical Liturgy remained, as was expected, more conservative. It preserves at least partially the ancient taxis and many hierarchs even nowadays still complete the proskomidē during the cheroubikon. Others, again in imitation of the priestly practice and for economy of time, complete it after their vesting at the end of Matins. Either way, the hierarchical practice preserved the commemoration within earshot of the people during the reception of the precious gifts in the great entrance. It "passed" into priestly practice probably from concelebrations, during which the first ranked of the priests strived, oftentimes inappropriately, to imitate impressive elements of the hierarchical Liturgy, such as censing after the small entrance and the commemoration during the great entrance. The inconsistency of the matter is also apparent from the fact that the general "Πάντων ὑμῶν…" (May the Lord God remember all of you…) precedes so that it becomes more specific later and so that it returns back to the general "καὶ πάντων ὑμῶν" (and all of you…) despite the fact that the commemoration by name or categories was already done by the celebrant

1080. "προλήψεως." Phountoulēs states in question 317, "The entire performance of the proskomidē constitutes a miniature of the Divine Liturgy and theologically and liturgically fits into its entire framework."

1081. See questions 239, 317, 373, 400, and 479.

priest during the service of the proskomidē.[1082] Namely, it causes a reduplication for no reason.[1083]

In a relatively recent answer (to question 558), we spoke regarding the unacceptability of the omission—or of the reading inaudibly, in other words, it is the same—of the great ektenēs of the Divine Liturgy and we attempted to find the reasons that caused it. There does not perhaps exist a more unfortunate interference in our liturgical tradition than this one. And the curious thing is the fact that the ektenēs is the most vital and flexible element of the Divine Liturgy and of the services in general. Instead of us keeping it from corruption and using it properly, we reject and ignore it, while at the same time we are talking about adapting the entreaties in our worship, as well as our worship's modernization and response to the immediate and current needs of the Christians.

I do not think that anyone doubts that the traditional and correct area for an insertion of entreaties, of petitions for the general and individual needs of the faithful, and for the commemoration of the names of living and dead is the ektenēs. This is also concluded from our contemporary practice where the ektenēs is not omitted, namely, in the monasteries and in the Slavic churches, but also from the slightly older practice, according to which the old-time priests not only did not omit the ektenēs, but even read the names of the living and those who had fallen asleep during it, perhaps of course with some degree of excess. The same thing is also done in the ekteneis of Vespers and of the end of Matins, where certainly in the monasteries they read immemorial lists of names, in sections,[1084] out of

1082. Phountoulēs appears to be describing a commemoration of names during a great entrance, which takes place according to the following order: "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός..." (May the Lord God remember all of you...), the commemoration of the names, "καὶ πάντων ὑμῶν" (and all of you...). Consequently, he comments that the specificity of the names is not necessary, due to the general commemoration and that this practice is a reduplication of the commemorations in the proskomidē.

1083. For additional discussion, see question 292.

1084. "κατὰ τμήματα." In monasteries, over time, large lists of names are accumulated, especially of the deceased. Due to their large number, these lists are often distributed in "sections" to individual monks and nuns (also on occasion

"Boldness."[1085] The same thing is also confirmed by the abbreviations of the ektenēs for the beginning of Matins (prior to the Six Psalms), marriage, unction, the funeral service, the memorial services, and so forth. The ektenēs under its full form ("great ektenēs")[1086] and under the abbreviated one is the space for the specification of entreaties and of the reference by name to the particular entreaties and needs of our brothers and sisters, namely, of the emperor during the abbreviated ektenēs of Matins, where it was replaced with the entreaty "for pious and orthodox Christians...,"[1087] of the newlyweds in marriage, of the sick in unction, of those who have fallen asleep in funerals and memorial services, and of all these together in the great ekteneis of Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy.

Space does not permit us to mention the specially developed lengthy petitions of other liturgical forms and ancient Liturgies, such as those of Saint Iakōvos of the Church of Jerusalem, of the evangelist Markos of Alexandria, and particularly the so-called Liturgy of Clement, which is contained in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and reflects the practice of the Church of Antioch around the end of the fourth century. These constitute true monuments, which express the richness and inventiveness of the love of Christians that embraces all the circumstances, all the needs and every category and class of people, and that comprehensively prays for support from God and their salvation. It is more practical for us to select some entreaties from the petitions of the ektenēs of the Divine Liturgy that are encountered in Byzantine manuscripts apart from the well-

---

to visiting pilgrims) who read them, usually silently, in parallel, at various appropriate liturgical times.

1085. "Παρρησία." The capitalization in the text is retained. In its monastic use, "boldness" is being used in the sense of the "zeal" (ζῆλος) that monks must temper to avoid falling out of "obedience" (ὑπακοή). In this case, the "boldness" or "zeal" being emphasized is reflected in the notion that all names must be read, even if it means distributing names in sections and including lay visitors in their reading.

1086. "μεγάλη ἐκτενής."

1087. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν..."

known ones and apart from those that are added in the monasteries, "for those who are in ministries"[1088] and so forth.

Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ συστάσεως καὶ εἰρήνης τῶν χριστιανῶν, ἀναρρύσεως τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, ἰάσεως τῶν ἀσθενούντων καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως τῶν κεκοιμημένων.	Again we pray for the preservation and peace of Christians, the deliverance of the prisoners, the healing of the sick, and for the repose of those who have fallen asleep.
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ (τοῦδε), ὑγείας...	Again we pray for the servant of God (name), for health...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ (τοῦδε), κοιμήσεως...	Again we pray for the servant of God (name), for repose...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ (τοῦδε) καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ὑγείας, σωτηρίας...	Again we pray for the servant of God (name) and all the people, for health, salvation...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ σάρκα συγγενῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐντειλαμένων ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀναξίοις εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαπώντων ἡμᾶς καὶ τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς...	Again we pray for our relations in the flesh and brothers and sisters and those for whom we the unworthy are commanded to pray, both those who love us and those who hate us.
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ περιστῶτος λαοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἐν ξενητείᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ καὶ πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐνοχλουμένων καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ πλεόντων καὶ πάντων τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν, ὑγείας...	Again we pray for the people here present and all brothers and sisters who are in foreign lands and in sickness and in captivity and who are troubled by an unclean spirit and who sail on the sea and all Orthodox Christians, for health...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ μακαρίας μνήμης καὶ ἀναπαύσεως πάντων τῶν προκεκοιμημένων χριστιανῶν τῶν ἐνθάδε κειμένων καὶ ἀπανταχοῦ ὀρθοδόξων.	Again we pray for the remission of sins and blessed memory and repose of all Orthodox Christians who have already fallen asleep who lie resting here and everywhere.

1088. "ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ταῖς διακονίαις." The full petition reads, "Ἔτι δεόμεθα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, τῶν ἐν ταῖς διακονίαις καὶ ἐν ἀποδημίαις ὄντων, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἐλεούντων, ἐλεησάντων, διακονούντων τε καὶ διακονησάντων ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ Ἁγίᾳ Μονῇ ταύτῃ." Even though monasteries are built upon times of common prayer, there are monks and nuns that are assigned "ministries" or work, such as the preparation of the trapeza, which prevents their attendance. Consequently, during services, those absent with a blessing for such work, "for those who are in ministries," are included in petitions.

Similar entreaties are encountered in certain manuscripts and in the service of the Small Hagiasmos, such as the ones below:

Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν θλιβομένων καὶ ἀρρωστούντων καὶ τοῦ ἐλέους Κυρίου ἐπιδεομένων...	Again we pray for those who are afflicted and in ill health and are in need of the mercy of the Lord...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείας καμνόντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν δι' εὐλόγους αἰτίας ἀπολειφθέντων...	Again we pray for those who suffer in sickness and for those absent for a good cause...
Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἐξορίαις καὶ αἰχμαλωσίαις κακουχουμένων χριστιανῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἵλεων αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ σωτηρίῳ ἀνακλήσει γενέσθαι τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν ἡμῶν...	Again we pray for our Christian brothers and sisters who suffer in exile and captivity and for God who loves humankind to be gracious onto them for salvific restoration...

The names were and are inserted in the special petitions for the living and dead as well as in between the petitions that we have referenced as an example and not during the entrance of the gifts. Our tradition is so rich and vital that it does not require us to make ill-conceived inventions to cover gaps that we ourselves created with a frivolous attitude towards our liturgical texts. The ektenēs—we repeat—covers the entire need that we tried to fulfill with the commemoration during the great entrance. It encompasses all the needs of the Church's members and covers all the entreaties of the faithful in a general manner, according to categories and by name.

570

In a case of a concelebration, the prayers are said by the priest first in rank or are distributed among the concelebrants, just as the exclamations. Similarly, are the blessings given by the first in rank or all successively?

In modern printed editions of the "Hieratika" or of the "Divine Liturgies," there exist detailed rubrics concerning priestly concelebration, which are good to be observed with strictness so that disorder is avoided as well as human resentments and minor misunderstandings among the celebrants. Especially regarding the exclamations,

I think that there does not exist a problem because the pertinent rubrics are clear. Thus, according to these directions of our liturgical books, the doxological conclusions of the prayers are said successively by the celebrants and according to their number. The rule is that the first ranked retains the principal exclamations. Specifically he says the exclamation of the prayer for the first antiphon ("For you are due all glory…"),[1089] the prayer of the trisagion ("For you, our God, are holy…"),[1090] the prayer of the ektenēs ("For you are a merciful God…"),[1091] the second prayer of the faithful ("That always guarded by your might…"),[1092] the prayer of the proskomidē ("Through the mercies…"),[1093] all the exclamations of the prayer of the holy anaphora ("The grace…,"[1094] and so forth, "Take, eat…,"[1095] "Drink of it all…,"[1096] "Especially…,"[1097] "Among the first…"[1098] and "And grant to us…"[1099]) except "Singing the triumphal hymn…"[1100] and "Your own of your own…"[1101] (which according to the old and correct taxis are said by the second priest), "The Holy Things are for the holy,"[1102] and after Holy Communion, "O Lord save your people…"[1103] and "Always, now and ever…."[1104] Recently, from a misunderstanding of the meaning and the grammatical and syntactical place of the exclamation, "Your own of your own…," the tendency exists for it to also be said by the first priest. I think not rightly.

Now with regard to the blessings, these are normally given by the first priest, who also is preeminently the celebrant. However,

---

1089. "Ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα,,,"
1090. "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν…"
1091. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων…"
1092. "Ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους σου πάντοτε φυλαττόμενοι…"
1093. "Διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν…"
1094. "Ἡ χάρις…"
1095. "Λάβετε, φάγετε…"
1096. "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες…"
1097. "Ἐξαιρέτως…"
1098. "Ἐν πρώτοις…"
1099. "Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν…"
1100. "Τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντα…"
1101. "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν…"
1102. "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις…"
1103. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου…"
1104. "Πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί,.."

in hierarchical concelebrations, it is customary in a brotherly and gracious manner for an allocation of the blessings to be done among the concelebrants, and this, I think, is rightly done. By analogy, it is good for the same thing to also be done in priestly concelebrations. However, the first retains the principal blessings, not because he wishes in this manner to show his superiority compared to his concelebrants or intentionally their disparagement. God help us! But because the correct taxis and strictness require this. Thus, the first priest—apart from the blessings that we included during the enumeration of the first priest's exclamations, which we did above ("The grace..." prior to the prayer of the holy anaphora and "O Lord save your people..." after Holy Communion), and "Blessed is the Kingdom..."[1105] of the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, which also itself is a type of blessing— must bless the entrance ("Blessed is the entrance of your holies..."),[1106] the upper throne (ἄνω καθέδρα) ("Blessed are you upon the throne of the glory of your kingdom..."),[1107] and must bless the people prior to the gospel reading, during "May the mercy of our great God...,"[1108] and during the dismissal ("May the blessing and mercy of the Lord...May Christ our true God...").[1109] It is good for the other intermediate blessings to be apportioned among the rest of the celebrants.

Our liturgical tradition gives us the possibility to search and find some basis for the support of this introduction of perhaps disputable strictness, namely, of the allocation of the blessings among the concelebrating priests, lest it be supposed that this is done for emotional or "pseudo-democratic" reasons. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who is most strict concerning liturgical taxis and tradition, gives us the following particularly interesting information for our case. During the hierarchical Liturgy, the hierarch blesses the people by "Peace be

1105. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."

1106. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου...." For a discussion of the translation of "your holies," see questions 170 and 600.

1107. "Εὐλογημένος εἶ ὁ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης..."

1108. "Καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ..."

1109. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου καὶ ἔλεος ἔλθοι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς... Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."

to all"[1110] prior to the gospel reading, as well as the gospeler deacon[1111] prior to the reading of the gospel and after this. However, the same one does not bless the reader of the epistle reading (prior and after the reading), but either the second hierarch does—if this is a case of a hierarchical concelebration—or the first of the priests, after —naturally—they first receive the "blessing" for this from the hierarch. We quote the passage, because it is important both regarding the taxis that it authentically records and for the theological justification that it offers. If this applies during the Liturgy of a hierarch, much more does it apply for the priestly concelebration. The hierarch "just as earlier provides the one who read the apostles' words with peace and a blessing. However, he himself does not give the peace [to the reader of the epistle], but through the first hierarch or presbyter of those under him, because these have at that time the rank of apostles, *while the first hierarch has the rank of Christ.*[1112] For this reason, he himself greets the Gospel book with peace, because he has the image of Christ, while those others greet the Apostolos with peace because they preserve the image of the apostles. And not on their own [authority] do they do this, but they say the peace after receiving a blessing" (*Dialogue*, chapter 98).[1113]

Conversely, regarding the reading of the prayers in a case of a priestly concelebration, as far as I know, old rubrics do not exist that prescribe what is to be done. There are three possibilities: either the first only himself reads the prayers within earshot of the concelebrants, or they all concurrently read them inaudibly, or the prayers are apportioned much the same way as the exclamations among the concelebrating priests. In contemporary practice, all three variants as above are also probably encountered. However, as far as we can conclude from the hierarchical Liturgy (by the imitation of the taxis of which the priestly concelebration is done), it is correct for the prayers to be said only by the first of the priests within earshot of the

1110. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι."

1111. "τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴ διάκονο."

1112. "ὁ πρῶτος ἀριχιερεὺς δὲ τὴν τάξιν ἔχει Χριστοῦ."

1113. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 246–249. The words in italics are missing from the quotation of the passage by Phountoulēs and have been included in the translation above.

concelebrants. In the hierarchical Liturgy, the hierarch only himself says the prayers, whether the same one says their exclamations or assigns them to the priests. He also of course says the prayers of the antiphons while he is found outside on the despotikon or in the middle of the temple. As it is well known, the exclamations of those three prayers are always said by the priests who are concelebrating.

For the allocation of the prayers among the concelebrants, an argument could be put forward again from the hierarchical Liturgy (but also from the taxis of priestly concelebration) that the prayer behind the ambōn is not said either by the hierarch or by the first priest during the concelebration. Consequently, why not distribute by analogy the other prayers as well? The answer also again is given to us by Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who attests that the hierarch says all the prayers, even the prayer behind the ambōn itself inaudibly "inside,"[1114] while the priest, after his blessing, says it within earshot of the people and in the middle of the temple. Thus, when referring to the priest just ordained, he writes: "The newly ordained priest offers this prayer to God, which also is the last one and is said behind the ambōn...but he first receives a hierarchical blessing... and he is blessed again after praying" (*Dialogue*, chapter 184).[1115] Elsewhere, he is more detailed and also gives the theological reasoning and justification for this practice. This is a description of the taxis of the hierarchical Liturgy: "The second of the priests exclaims the prayer behind the ambōn within earshot for the people outside the sacred bēma [elsewhere he states that the priest says the prayer 'behind the ambōn in the middle of the temple, that all will hear and join in prayer with him, and that it is done before God for all the people,'[1116] *Dialogue*, chapter 355], praying this last prayer for the people, while doing the work of the hierarch, because both the beginnings and the end of the prayers are his work. Nevertheless, the hierarch inside inaudibly also offers this prayer to God. Therefore,

1114. "ἔνδον."
1115. PG 155:393b, 393c.
1116. PG 155:659a.

for this reason, he seals the priest who approaches after saying the prayer" (*Dialogue*, chapter 99).[1117]

According to the above and by analogy, we can come to the conclusion that it is in good order and consistent with the tradition, from as much evidence that we have, for the prayers during priestly concelebrations to be said only by the first priest, except the prayer behind the ambōn, which is said by the second in rank. At any rate, in a case of allocating the prayers among the concelebrants, a matter that according to the above must be considered not in proper order, the first priest must necessarily say the prayer of the entrance, the prayer of the trisagion hymn, the prayer of the Cherubic hymn ("No one is worthy…"),[1118] the prayer of the anaphora from "The grace…" up until "May the mercy of our Great God…,"[1119] the prayer of the elevation of the holy bread ("Hearken, O Lord…The Holy Things are for the holy),[1120] and the blessing/prayer of the dismissal ("May the blessing and mercy of the Lord…May Christ our true God…").[1121]

571

In some temples, it is customary after the reading of the gospel or after the sermon for the exclamation "That always guarded by your might…"[1122] not to be immediately said, but the small synaptē ("Again and again…")[1123] and the second prayer of the faithful ("Again and oftentimes…")[1124] to precede. The ektenēs, the petitions for the catechumens, and the first prayer of the faithful with the synaptē and its exclamation are said inaudibly. Is this halfway practice correct?[1125]

1117. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 263.

1118. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος…"

1119. "Καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ…"

1120. "Πρόσχες Κύριε…τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."

1121. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου καὶ ἔλεος ἔλθοι ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς…Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν…"

1122. "Ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους σου πάντοτε φυλαττόμενοι…"

1123. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι…"

1124. "Πάλιν καὶ πολλάκις…"

1125. "ἐνδιάμεση" (halfway), here refers to a practice that omits some elements, but not all.

This practice, which apparently is quite spread, possesses an indisputable advantage over the other one that is more widely customary in the Greek Church, in this entire unit being said inaudibly (namely, being omitted), which follows the reading of the sacred gospel or the sermon and contains the great ektenēs, the petitions for the catechumens, and the two prayers of the faithful with the small synaptes that introduce them and the exclamations that conclude them. The advantage consists in the fact that at least it preserves the second prayer of the faithful, with its natural liturgical framework (synaptē and exclamation) in the correct place and according to the correct taxis. Thus, the exclamation, "That always guarded by your might...," is not presented disconnected with what preceded and irrelevant to what is celebrated, since it cannot have the slightest connection either with the readings or with the sermon. The way that it has remained to be said alone, "stray," in some manner, has no independent meaning. After the wrongly introduced omission or inaudible reading of this entire unit, this precise sense of a void and of its inconsistency caused the restoration, the retention at least of the small synaptē before the exclamation of the second prayer of the faithful (as an attempt for a "remedy" of the absurd). And up to this point, things are fine.

However, for two reasons, this solution must be characterized as inappropriate. First, because it attempts to remedy a disconnection with another disconnection. The small synaptē, which according to the above proposed arrangement precedes the exclamation "That always guarded by your might...," while it lessens the impression of the exclamation's disconnection, here again cannot stand independently. The small synaptē is an abridgment of the great synaptē (of the "litany of peace") or ektenēs, namely, an abbreviated form of the diaconal commands that call the people to prayer while reminding them of the entreaties that were formulated in detail in the great synaptē or ektenēs. This is what happens in all services without any exception, namely, in Vespers, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy.

We merely recall as a most characteristic example, the Matins of Pascha, where after the litany of peace, which is said at the beginning, we have eight such small synaptes, which abridge the great one

and summarize its entreaties, and are inserted between the odes of the canons. A similar form is also followed by the ancient "asmatic"/ parish services of Vespers and Matins, as well as the Divine Liturgy, which continues to preserve the prescriptions of the "asmatic" Typikon. The small synaptes prior to the second and third antiphons constitute an abridgment of the litany of peace, namely, of the great synaptē, and the small synaptes prior to the first and second prayers of the faithful constitute an abridgment of the great ektenēs after the gospel reading. By the preservation of the second small synaptē, the disconnection is not removed as long as the ektenēs is omitted. The community is called upon to persist "again and again"[1126] in entreaties of prayer that have not been posed.

The second reason for which this solution must be precluded is the fact that, while it does not correctly and traditionally solve the issue, it creates an illusion of a solution, namely, a patchwork taxis, which is also unacceptable and again leaves open the large question of the ektenēs and the petitions for the catechumens and the first prayer of the faithful, and of what must be done with them.

We will not return to the issue above, because we addressed it from many points of view in previous answers.[1127] However, a few words will be permitted for us as an epilogue to the entire issue and as its necessary summary:

1. The omission of the ektenēs, the petitions for the catechumens, and the two prayers of the faithful with their liturgical framework (synaptē–exclamation) is not a minor issue. It substantially meddles with the taxis of the Divine Liturgy and breaks the liturgical unity of the Orthodox Church, since the monasteries and the Slavic churches never adopted this innovation.

2. It began to be introduced and spread in periods where novel ideas became uncritically prevalent concerning modernizing and shortening the Divine Liturgy and the sacred services more generally, of avoiding so-called repetitions, but also of a substantial shift of the weight of the celebration of the divine mystagogy from the

1126. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι."

1127. See questions 558 and 551–553 especially.

center to the periphery.[1128] The omission of this unit (of the ektenēs up until the second prayer of the faithful) gave time for overdone and anti-traditional chants during the recitation of the diaconal petitions and exclamations, as well as the responses of the people.[1129]

3. Not only for reasons of consistency with the handed down text of the Divine Liturgy, but also for reasons of substance, the omission of the ektenēs and the petitions for the catechumens is unacceptable, despite the exaggerated and overemphasized inconsistency due to the absence of catechumens in the synaxis of the Church.

4. The cover-up of the omission with the pretext of reading inaudibly is likewise unacceptable. The diaconal petitions (ektenēs, the petitions for the catechumens, and synaptes) are addressed to the people and not to God. It is well known how much disturbance the recitation "inaudibly" of this entire unit (diaconal petitions, and priestly prayers and exclamations) during the epistle reading, gospel reading, or wherever else, causes to the smooth flow of the Divine Liturgy, even if a bad habit does not permit us to realize (due to familiarity) all this unacceptable disorder.

In closing, let us recall a wise statement of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, which has complete application to our case, as well as to a myriad of other similar cases in divine worship. The Saint so says that there is nothing worse in liturgical taxis and tradition than to make disorder a habit ("to advance disorder into a habit,"[1130] *Dialogue*, chapter 365). The circumstances are then hard to cure if not even incurable because we have a real reversal of values: disorder is considered taxis and taxis disorder; the innovation, tradition, and the tradition, a novelty. We have seen enough of such things in older and more recent responses: the transfer of the sermon to the koinōnikon,[1131] the chanting of unspecified words[1132] instead of the

1128. In other words, from the essential to the superficial.

1129. For examples regarding Phountoulēs's thoughts on simple chanting and consequently shortening the time necessary for the Liturgy, see the answers to questions 50, 238, and 286.

1130. "εἰς ἔθος τὴν ἀταξίαν προβῆναι," PG 155:680b.

1131. Question 125.

1132. This refers to various innovations including personal favorites and whims of the chanters that have no place in the koinōnikon.

koinōnikon,[1133] the imparting of Holy Communion after the end of the Divine Liturgy,[1134] the reading of prayers not in earshot,[1135] kneeling during the consecration of the precious gifts,[1136] and other innumerable things.

572

In the phrase, "ὅτι πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων" (for every good gift and every perfect gift is from above coming down from you the Father of lights), of the prayer behind the ambōn, where must the comma be placed? Because there is no consistency in the Hieratika, and others recite it in different manners.

This question, as pedantic as it appears at first glance, is indicative of the diligence of the inquirer, as well as of all those who together with him treat our sacred liturgical texts in a similar manner. This question, all else being equal, recalls the Lord's words regarding "one iōta" and the "one keraia" of the Law (Matthew 5:18). The commas are not simply decorative elements in the written word, as the breathing and accent marks have come in part to be regarded nowadays. Their correct placement in the text facilitates understanding, just as conversely their incorrect placement may not only obscure the meaning and ruin the recitation but can give precisely the opposite meaning to the word. This one here, of course, is not such an extreme case as those that are well known to us from the ancient oracles.[1137] However, we will actually see in the example that the question poses, how

1133. Questions 338 and 339.

1134. Question 185.

1135. Questions 551–553.

1136. Questions 547 and 548.

1137. Phountoulēs is referring to the reputation of ancient oracles for covering possible outcomes through syntactic devices and thus avoiding inaccuracy. In certain instances, the possible placement of punctuation such as a comma could give various meanings to an oracle. The example often cited in modern Greek culture, "ἤξεις ἀφήξεις οὐκ ἐν πολέμῳ θνήξεις," can be translated "you will go, you will return, not in the war shall you die" or "you will go, you will return not, in the war shall you die," depending on where the comma is placed. For a scholarly discussion of ancient divination at Delphi, see Aleš Chalupa, "Pythiai and Inspired Divination in the Delphic Oracle: Can Cognitive Sciences Pro-

the comma plays a crucial role in the comprehension of a text, which in fact is not understood from a book, but is recited by the priest and is heard by people who overwhelmingly may not be so familiar with the archaic language of divine worship.

The phrase above is, as is well known, a quotation from the Catholic Epistle of Saint James (Iakōvos) (chapter 1, verse 17) with a slight modification, namely, the replacement of the preposition "ἀπό" (from) with "ἐκ σοῦ [τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων]" (from you [the Father of lights])" towards the end of the passage.[1138] This reading has been detected in only one manuscript of the New Testament, *Sinai 260* from the twelfth century, into which has possibly crept the influence of the prayer behind the ambōn. This correction was done to the liturgical text certainly in order for the addressee of the prayer, God the Father, the "Father of lights," to be better specified. The prayer behind the ambōn, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you...,"[1139] is addressed to the first person of the Holy Trinity, to whom as a rule all the ancient prayers of the Divine Liturgy are also addressed. The pronoun "σοῦ" (you) establishes this most obviously, just as we incidentally saw in an answer to another question.[1140] The difference with the biblical passage lies in the change of voice to the second person, while in the Epistle of James (Iakōvos) it is constructed in the third. There,[1141] it is written in a declaratory manner that the Father of lights is the provider of all good gifts and perfect gifts. Here,[1142] the same provider of good things, God the Father, is entreated to grant to His people salvation, blessings, and all the final entreaties, which are concisely and summarily formulated in this last prayer, the conclusion of the Divine Liturgy.

---

vide Us with an Access to 'Dead Minds'?" *Journal of Cognitive Historiography* 1 (2014): 24–51.

1138. "Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων..." (every good gift and every perfect gift is from above coming down from the Father of lights...), Jas 1:17.

1139. "Ὁ εὐλογῶν τοὺς εὐλογοῦντας σε, Κύριε..."

1140. See question 568.

1141. The scriptural passage.

1142. The liturgical text.

In any case, the manner in which the biblical passage is inserted at this point is worthy of particular attention, as well as the manner in which the beginning and end of the Divine Liturgy are masterfully linked. The first entreaty at its beginning is peace ("In peace let us pray to the Lord")[1143] and in particular "peace from above"[1144] and the "peace of the whole world."[1145] The Divine Liturgy originally ended with the simple command, "Let us go forth in peace."[1146] The dismissal prayer behind the ambōn constitutes a development of this command. The emphasis also here falls on the entreaty concerning peace ("Grant peace to your world...")[1147] and in particular on the perfect peace, on "the peace from above" of the litany of peace, since together with all the good gifts of God also this peace "from above" comes down, being provided by the Father of lights. This is also the meaning of the biblical citation, "καταβαῖνον ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων" (coming down from you the Father of lights) of the prayer behind the ambōn, just as precisely also "καταβαῖνον ἐκ" (coming down from) [or according to another reading: "παρά" (from)] "τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων" (the Father of lights) of the passage of Saint James (Iakōvos). They constitute an explanation of the preceding phrase, "ἄνωθέν ἐστι" (is from above). This is an answer to the question of what is meant by this "ἄνωθεν" (from above), from which peace descends and all good things are provided.

Consequently, just as in the biblical passage so also in the prayer behind the ambōn, the correct place of the comma is precisely before the explanation:

"Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι, καταβαῖνον ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων"

"Every good and perfect gift is from above, coming down from you the Father of Lights."

Conversely, the other way is mistaken where the comma is placed after "ἐστὶ καταβαῖνον" (is coming down), the explanation

1143. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
1144. "ἄνωθεν εἰρήνην."
1145. "εἰρήνη τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου."
1146. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."
1147. "Εἰρήνην τῷ κόσμῳ σου δώρησαι..."

of which is considered "ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Πατρός" (from you the Father). "Ἐστὶ καταβαῖνον" is a nonstandard expression that does not fit into a text with such pure koine Greek language as the epistle of Saint James (Iakōvos).

Similarly wrong are the two extreme ways of punctuation, the one without any comma in the whole phrase, which creates difficulties for the proper recitation of the text, and the other, the precisely opposite, which destroys the unity of the reading when placing commas after every two or three words: "πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθή, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον, ἄνωθέν ἐστι, καταβαῖνον, ἐκ σοῦ, τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων" (for every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, coming down, from you, the Father of lights). The strange thing is the fact that these forms, as well as others in between, are encountered in various printed editions of our liturgical books. In some of them, the paradox indeed occurs when the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you..."[1148] (in the Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos and Basileios the Great) is quoted twice in the same book, the same text having one punctuation in the one prayer and another in the other.

Let us also note something else that concerns the same prayer behind the ambōn. It is unrelated to our question but related to a subject that is often returns as a topic of discussion. The original text of the prayer, as it is encountered in the most ancient and in the majority of manuscripts, contains the phrase, "τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν" (to our emperors). Of the codices that Professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas of eternal memory used in the edition of the *Three Liturgies*, Athens 1935, seven completely omit this phrase, one corrects it with, "τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἡμῶν" (to our pious ones), two "τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἡμῖν" (to the pious among us), and two simply "τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν" (to the pious). These manuscripts were written after the fall of Constantinople.[1149]

1148. "Ὁ εὐλογῶν τοὺς εὐλογοῦντας σε, Κύριε..."

1149. Τρεμπέλας, Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι, 154. In the prayers, these insertions occur after "Εἰρήνην τῷ κόσμῳ σου δώρησαι..." (Grant peace to your world...).

573

In the service of the Small Hagiasmos prior to the trisagion, we have the exhortation, "Let us pray to the Lord,"[1150] and immediately the familiar exclamation, without the prayer of the trisagion. Was perhaps the prayer subsequently replaced by the four troparia that precede the trisagion?

574

While there exists an invocation of the Holy Spirit in the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos, why is it lacking in the corresponding prayer of the Small Hagiasmos? Perhaps the prayer ought to be supplemented because this raises the reasonable question regarding when the water is sanctified.

We will examine both these questions together, not only because they refer to the same service, the service of the Small Hagiasmos, but because the solutions to the questions that they pose, even if they have a different explanation, presuppose the knowledge of the historical development of this service, which by necessity we must address in summary. Related to the questions above are also answers 137, 377, and 394, to which the solution was sought in the same manner. The historical development of every service, as it is reflected in external witnesses regarding it, as well as in the large number of manuscripts that contain it, is the only certain route that can guide us to the solution of many enigmas of our liturgical practice.

In this case, the service of the Small Hagiasmos is contained in a very large number of manuscripts, Euchologia, or independent "Hagiasmataria," with a significant amount of variations that relate not only to the form of the service, but also to its individual elements. But even up until nowadays, its form has not been completely crystalized since in modern printed editions we also find it abbreviated or with elements other than those that exist in the service generally considered as being in force, namely, the well-known form that became prevalent in the printed Hagiasmataria or Small Euchologia. To get an idea of its diversity, it suffices to study its

1150. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

edition in the *Small Euchologion* of Professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas of eternal memory, volume 2, Athens 1955, pp. 47–74 and particularly pages 52–74, where the text is located and the abnormally great number of variations are noted for such a small service (from the manuscripts of the National Library of Greece) in the prayers, troparia, and standard rubrics, as well as in other elements of the service of the Small Hagiasmos.[1151] The reason attributed for such a large number of differences and variations is obvious. The cause is its frequent celebration, inside and outside temples, in homes, on ships, in fields, in vineyards, in gardens, and wherever else, for the healing of people and animals, deliverance from various natural ills, as well as a blessing and sanctification of the works of the hands of human beings.

And as long as the blessing of the waters was done for all the needs above during the Divine Liturgy, in place of the antiphons or between the antiphons and (small) entrance, it retained its original form and liturgical content. One or at most two prayers were sufficient for the sanctification of the water. The entrance was done, and the Liturgy was celebrated in due order. However, the need for the celebration of the Hagiasmos outside of the temple or, according to the modern tendency that is also observed in the celebration of mysteries and other sacred rites, outside of the Liturgy, caused the development of the Small Hagiasmos as an independent rite. Since this detachment from the Divine Liturgy and the formation of a new service occurred in a relatively later period, the completion took place from loans and imitations of other services, given that the peak era of creative liturgical development belonged to the past. Since "from birth," in some manner, we are used to this taxis and out of piety we view its structure with sympathy, it is not easy for us to take a critical stance towards it and to point out its weaknesses. In any case, its patchwork form is clear as well as the stitching together of heterogeneous elements for its formation out of borrowings from related and unrelated services. This becomes more manifest in the manuscripts, where different layers of additions, elaborations, and

1151. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955), 2:47–74.

imitations of other services are discerned, and where some remained unfinished, others were forgotten, and others survived with their entrance into the first printed editions.

Thus, influences and borrowings are detected from the preexisting related service of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany (prayer of inclination, the immersion of the precious cross, entreaties in the litany of peace), from the taxis of processions and antiphons (ektenēs, the alphabetical stichēra, invocations of saints), from the service of Matins (Psalms 142 and 50, "God is the Lord...,"[1152] apolytikia, stichologia of the ninth ode), and from the Divine Liturgy, as remnants of the old connection of the Hagiasmos with it (trisagion, readings, prayer of the sanctification of the water).

So, through this winding path, we reached the disputed elements, which are posed by the question; the trisagion and the consecratory prayer. Both, as we said, are a borrowing from the Divine Liturgy or imitations of its taxis. Thus, we have, for this first element, the diaconal command, "Let us pray to the Lord," the exclamation of the prayer of the trisagion, "For you our God are holy...,"[1153] and the chanting of the trisagion, just as precisely in the Divine Liturgy. The prayer of the trisagion is omitted here and the four troparia ("Now the time has come..."[1154] and so forth) are inserted between the exclamation and the trisagion. In the second troparion ("You rained down streams..."),[1155] mention is clearly made concerning a temple of the Theotokos with a miracle working hagiasma (ἁγίασμα), which is none other than the famed temple and the Hagiasma of the Blachernai in Constantinople. Wherever in the troparia of the contemporary service mention is made of a "temple" (ναός) of the Theotokos, without doubt the temple of the Blachernai is meant, and wherever a "City" (Πόλις) of the Theotokos is mentioned, Constantinople is meant. In this temple, the service of the Small Hagiasmos perhaps received its full formation. The element of the service that especially interests us is identically encountered in a singular very long cere-

1152. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."
1153. "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."
1154. "Νῦν ἐπέστη ὁ καιρός..."
1155. "Νάμασιν ἐπομβρίσας..."

mony, which is preserved in the *Codex Paris (Coislin) 213* from the year 1027 and is entitled "Service and typikon of the holy bath of Blachernai."[1156] The differences with the present taxis are small: there are three troparia ("Now the time has come...," Glory, "You rained down streams...," Both now, "O most holy Lady Theotokos...[1157]), after that "Lord have mercy" three times, "Let us pray to the Lord," "For you our God are holy...," and the trisagion hymn. And in both cases, there does not exist a prayer of the trisagion, but the three troparia precede and do not follow the exclamation, in order to support the hypothesis that they replace the prayer. The exclamation appears in some manner "stray,"[1158] namely, without concluding the prayer to which it belongs. The imitation of the Divine Liturgy is clear, but a somewhat free imitation. It retains the impressive elements (diaconal command, exclamation, trisagion), adds three or

1156. "Ἀκολουθία καὶ τυπικὸν τοῦ ἁγίου λού[σ]ματος τῶν Βλαχερνῶν." The "bath" (λοῦσμα) here refers to one used for sacred bathing or washing and maintained by a diakonia (διακονία), a Byzantine charitable association or confraternity whose work focused on the ritual bath. Its functions included the bathing of the poor and the distribution of food at the bath. Sacred ritual bathing is also discussed in question 376. In the current question, the distinction is made between waters that are sanctified from inception because they flow from miraculous or sacred springs (ἁγιάσματα, hagiasmata) and those sanctified through prayer (ἁγιασμός, hagiasmos). For further discussion of the diakonia and ritual baths, see Paul Magdalino, "Church, Bath, and Diakonia in Medieval Constantinople," in *Church and People in Byzantium, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986*, ed. Rosemary Morris (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman, and Modern Greek Studies, 1986), 165–188, and Paul Magdalino, "The culture of water in the 'Macedonian renaissance,' in *Fountains and Water Culture in Byzantium*, ed. Brooke Shilling and Paul Stephenson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 130–144. For a description of the baths in Constantinople based on archaeological remains, including the Blachernai church complex, see Robert Ousterhout, "Water and Healing in Constantinople: Reading the Architectural Remains," in *Life is Short, Art Long: The Art of Healing in Byzantium*, ed. Brigette Pitarakis (Istanbul: Pera Museum Publications, 2015), 64–77. Additional discussion of sacred bathing can be found in Εὐλόγιος Κουρίλας, "Ἁγιασμάτιον Θράκης καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Τὰ ἱερὰ λουτρά," *Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ Θρακικοῦ Λαογραφικοῦ καὶ Γλωσσικοῦ Θησαυροῦ* 23 (1958): 65–184 and Μανουὴλ Γεδεών, "Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἁγιάσματα Θρακικά," *Θρακικά* 9 (1938): 101–121.

1157. "Παναγία Δέσποινα..."

1158. "ἀδέσποτη."

four troparia, but omits the long prayer, which was already said inaudibly in the Divine Liturgy and consequently was not heard by the people. Besides, its entreaties concerning the worthiness of the community to chant the trisagion hymn are contained in the last troparion ("...guide aright the works of our hands and ask forgiveness of our transgressions while we chant the hymn of the angels").[1159] According to the modern practice, it is not a rare phenomenon for "stray" (as we called them) exclamations to be used in divine worship, either because the prayer has been read beforehand (for example, the prayers and the exclamations of Vespers and Matins) or because the prayer is completely omitted and only the exclamation remains as the most resilient remnants of an older practice. The same thing also happens here. As along as the celebration of the Hagiasmos was inserted into the Divine Liturgy, the whole system functioned properly. After the separation, only the more popular elements remained: command of the deacon, exclamation, (troparia), trisagion, epistle reading, and gospel reading. The prayers, which connected all these individual elements in the Divine Liturgy, were omitted. And rather well. They would have been excessive.

The great consecratory prayer of the water, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel and wonderful in works..."[1160] does not indeed have a clear invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the water. One of its phrases ("and send down your blessing on us, both through the partaking and sprinkling of this water")[1161] seems to make up for this deficiency. Similarly also the other prayer in use, "O great and most high God, who is worshipped in Holy Trinity...,"[1162] which is customarily called "Hagioreitikē,"[1163] also itself does not have a clear invocation, which also here is fulfilled with the emphasis of certain entreaties ("send down upon us your

1159. "τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα κατεύθυνον, καὶ συγχώρησιν τῶν πταισμάτων ἡμῶν αἴτησαι ἐν τῷ ψάλλειν ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀγγέλων τὸν ὕμνον."

1160. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ μέγας τῇ βουλῇ καὶ θαυμαστὸς τοῖς ἔργοις..."

1161. "καὶ διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεως τε καὶ ῥαντισμοῦ τὴν σὴν εὐλογίαν ἡμῖν κατάπεμψον."

1162. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος, ὁ ἐν Τριάδι ἁγίᾳ προσκυνούμενος..."

1163. "Ἁγιορειτική." In other words, having its origins on Mount Athos. See question 376 regarding this prayer.

blessing and the gift of healings upon this water...through the partaking of this water...send down upon us your blessing...").[1164] In certain manuscripts, or even in printed editions, a cross (†) is added at the points above in another hand within the text or in the margins, obviously in order for it to be signified that the priest then blesses the water. I have personally seen in a second-hand printed edition an invocation added by hand in the margins, probably taken from the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos, with the indication that it is said "three times." It should be noted that in that service there are two invocations, which are probably due to the joining of two old prayers for consecration of water.

The answer to the question, why there does not exist a clear invocation for the consecration of the water in the prayer in use, can perhaps be given only from the original derivation and use of this prayer. Indeed, it bears the title, "Prayer of the bathing-place of Blachernai,"[1165] but is encountered identically in the service, "of the holy bath of Blachernai,"[1166] of *Paris 213*, which we mentioned above. In this service, the prayer above is included not as a consecratory prayer of the water since the water of the Hagiasma of Blachernai, as a sacred spring of the Theotokos, was already sanctified from inception. For this reason, it is also introduced in a discreet manner, not as a request for sanctification of water, but for the healing and salvation of those who with faith would be sprinkled, drink, and be washed in it. Thus, not only is the absence of the invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the water explained, which very naturally one would expect, but also the reference to the pool of Siloam and to holy baptism, as well as the readings "immersion" (καταδύσεως) instead of "partaking" (μεταλήψεως), which are encountered in the manuscripts. The service for the bath of Blachernai, from which the present prayer is derived, as well as basically the service of the Small Hagiasmos, attests that a real sacred bathing in the hagiasma was

1164. "κατάμεπμψον ἡμῖν τὴν σὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τῶν ἰαμάτων μεταλήψεως ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο... διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεως...τὴν σὴν εὐλογίαν ἡμῖν κατάπεμψον..."

1165. "Εὐχὴ τοῦ κολυμβίου τῶν Βλαχερνῶν." See question 376 for a discussion of the translation of "bathing-place."

1166. "τοῦ ἁγίου λού[σ]ματος τῶν Βλαχερνῶν."

done, a practice that survived in sacred springs, thermae[1167] or ordinary hagiasmata,[1168] almost up until our days.[1169]

In parallel with the prayer above, as well as with the other one that we mentioned further above ("O great and most high God, who is worshipped in Holy Trinity…"), which also itself must be derived from analogous sacred baths and hagiasmata, there existed in use brief prayers with a clear invocation of the Holy Spirit in order to consecrate water. Such prayers are "O Lord our God, who changed in the presence of Moses the bitter water…,"[1170] "Establisher of waters, creator of all things…,"[1171] "O great and glorious God…,"[1172] and others that are encountered in the *Barberini Euchologion* and in other old codices.

1167. "θερμές." In other words, bathing facilities, usually on a large scale in the Roman Empire. For a history of bathing in the empire, see Fikret Yegül, *Bathing in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

1168. "ἁγιάσματα" (hagiasmata) is the plural of hagiasma (ἁγίασμα).

1169. For example, it is common for Orthodox pilgrims to wash their faces using the waters from the miraculous spring of Saint Athanasios on Mount Athos, or to bathe in the sanctifying waters of the Jordan River in a white robe (chitōn) that they intend to save as a burial garment, see Holy Nativity Convent, *A Pilgrim's Guide to the Holy Land* (Seattle, WA: St. Nectarios Press, 1997), 137. For a discussion of white baptismal garments, see questions 351 and 352.

1170. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὸ πικρὸν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ Μωϋσέως…" in Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 133.2.

1171. "Κτίστα τῶν ὑδάτων, δημιουργὲ τῶν ἁπάντων…" in Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 231.2. For a discussion of this prayer, see André Jacob, "Note sur la Prière Κτίστα τῶν ὑδάτων de l'Euchologie Barberini," *Byzantion* 56 (1986): 139–147.

1172. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ μεγαλώνυμος…" This prayer is found in *Codex Sinai 971, 982*, and *987*, based on Κωνσταντῖνος Καραϊσαρίδης, "Οἱ ἀκολουθίες τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ ἡ θεραπευτικὴ τους διάσταση," in *Πρακτικὰ Ι΄ Πανελληνίου Λειτουργικοῦ Συμποσίου, "Ἡ Ὑγεία καὶ ἡ Ἀσθένεια στὴ Λειτουργικὴ Ζωὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας,"* 8, http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/commitees/liturgical/karaisaridis_akolouthies.pdf (accessed December 21, 2021).

575

Why does the ninth ode of the canon for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross have two heirmoi? When the katabasies, "Inscribing a cross...,"[1173] are chanted, are both heirmoi of the ninth ode chanted or only the first ("O Theotokos, you are a mystical paradise...")[1174]?

The canon for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, a work of the hymnographer Saint Kosmas the Jerusalemite, bishop of Maiuma, indeed has this peculiarity.[1175] Its ninth ode has two heirmoi, "O Theotokos, you are a mystical paradise..." and "Through the fruit of the tree...,"[1176] the first heirmos with two troparia and the second with three. As far as we know, it is the only case of a canon that has two heirmoi in one of its odes in the entire creative work of Kosmas. Other hymnographers are accustomed to this, as for example Saint Andreas of Crete in his great canon.[1177] However, not Kosmas. Likewise strange is the fact that in the canon for the Precious Cross only the ninth ode has double heirmoi. If this system was followed in the entire canon, and all its odes had two heirmoi, we would have a very regular exception in the present canon. However, there is another peculiarity. The canon has an acrostic, "Σταυρῷ πεποιθώς, ὕμνον ἐξερεύγομαι" (Having trusted in the Cross, I utter a hymn), in which the beginning letters of the heirmoi of each ode are also included. The acrostic is completed in the first part of the ninth ode (MAI: "Μυστικός...,"[1178] "Ἀγαλλέσθω...,"[1179] "Ιερόν..."[1180]). The three troparia of the second heirmos repeat the same beginning letters, namely, the end of the entire acrostic (MAI: "Μὴν

1173. "Σταυρὸν χαράξας..."
1174. "Μυστικὸς εἶ Θεοτόκε, παράδεισος..."
1175. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).
1176. "Ὁ διὰ βρώσεως τοῦ ξύλου..."
1177. Saint Andreas of Crete (ca. 660–ca. 740).
1178. "Mystical." Several times, Phountoulēs quotes a variation of the troparion using "μυστικῶς" instead of "μυστικός" in the text of the answer.
1179. Third person singular present passive imperative of ἀγάλλω, "I exult, rejoice greatly," here translated as "Rejoice."
1180. "Sacred."

τὴν πικρίαν …,"[1181] "Ἀδιαλείπτως…,"[1182] "Ἵνα τὸν τύπον…"[1183]), while the heirmos remains outside of the acrostic or repeats the beginning letter of the fourth troparion of the eighth ode, "O" ("Οἱ τῇ θείᾳ ψήφῳ…,"[1184] the fourth troparion of the eighth ode, "Ὁ διὰ βρώσεως τοῦ ξύλου…,"[1185] the "another heirmos" of the ninth ode).[1186]

Since Saint Kosmas is simple and plain in his work and remains faithful to the prescriptions for the composition of canons, the first thing that one would suspect is that the second part of the ninth ode of the canon above, for all these reasons and peculiarities uncustomary to Kosmas, is not his own work, but that of some other composer. Some inconsistencies in accentuation that are encountered in these three troparia perhaps also supported this. Namely, while syllabically they are completely identical with the heirmos ("Ὁ διὰ βρώσεως," Through the fruit), the accents do not always coincide with it ("ὑδάτων," "προκατηνέχθη," "παγκλήρως," "ἠγλαϊσμένον,"), a thing that is not customary in Kosmas.[1187] Nevertheless, it is not easy for such a hypothesis to be supported. The second heirmos and its

---

1181. "You did not permit the bitterness of the tree…"

1182. "O Lord, you raised by the Cross those continuously sinking into the darkness of the forefather…"

1183. "O Lord, that you might show the figure of the Cross…"

1184. "Rejoice faithful Christian emperors chosen by divine election…"

1185. "Through the fruit of the tree…"

1186. The order appears as follows in the Mēnaion:

Eighth Ode
Heirmos - Εὐλογεῖτε Παῖδες…
Troparia (4) - Ὑψουμένου ξύλου… Ὑψουμένου ξύλου… Γηγενεῖς παλάμαις… Οἱ τῇ θείᾳ ψήφῳ…
Ninth Ode
Heirmos - Μυστικὸς εἰ Θεοτόκε Παράδεισος…
Troparia (2) - Ἀγαλλέσθω τὰ δρυμοῦ ξύλα σύμπαντα… Ἱερὸν ἠγέρθη κέρας θεόφροσι…
Another Heirmos - Ὁ διὰ βρώσεως τοῦ ξύλου…
Troparia (3) - Μὴ τὴν πικρίαν τὴν τοῦ ξύλου… Ἀδιαλείπτως βαπτομένους… Ἵνα τὸν τύπον ὑποδείξῃς…

1187. The following are the texts of the hymns referenced with the words underlined, which contain the differences in accentuation with the heirmos:

Εἱρμὸς Ἕτερος.
Ἦχος πλ. δ'. Ὁ Εἱρμός.

three troparia, as well as the whole canon, are of lofty inspiration, have a refrain ("ἦν πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις," which all the hosts), just as Kosmas is accustomed to composing, and have a vocabulary that matches his pen. Inconsistencies in accentuation also likewise exist in other troparia of the same canon. Moreover, the text of these four troparia is so meager that it is insufficient for a special study to be based on it in order to verify with internal criteria whether they are authentic or false works of Kosmas. However, it appears that the canon is transmitted in the manuscripts in this manner, namely, the ninth ode alone has two heirmoi, just as it is published in the Mēnaia in use.

The occasional commentators of the canon of the Exaltation, as well as the biographers of the composer Kosmas, do not dispute the authenticity of the second heirmos and the three troparia, but they point out the unusual nature of the matter and attempt to explain it. The professor Theocharēs Detorakēs in his brilliant study, *Kosmas the Hymnographer, Life and Work* (Thessaloniki 1979), points out fifteen named or anonymous, published or unpublished, commentaries of this canon (pp. 179–180).[1188] There are three versions that are put for-

---

Ὁ διὰ βρώσεως τοῦ ξύλου, τῷ γένει προσγενόμενος θάνατος, διὰ Σταυροῦ κατήργηται σήμερον· τῆς γὰρ προμήτορος ἡ παγγενής, κατάρα διαλέλυται, τῷ βλαστῷ τῆς ἀγνῆς Θεομήτορος· ἣν πᾶσαι αἱ Δυνάμεις, τῶν οὐρανῶν μεγαλύνουσι.

Τροπάρια.

Μὴ τὴν πικρίαν τὴν τοῦ ξύλου, ἐάσας ἀναιρέσιμον Κύριε, διὰ Σταυροῦ τελείως ἐξήλειψας· ὅθεν καὶ ξύλον ἔλυσε ποτέ, πικρίαν ὑδάτων Μερρᾶς, προτυποῦν τοῦ Σταυροῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν· ἣν πᾶσαι αἱ Δυνάμεις, τῶν οὐρανῶν μεγαλύνουσιν.

Ἀδιαλείπτως βαπτομένους, τῷ ζόφῳ τοῦ προπάτορος Κύριε, διὰ Σταυροῦ ἀνύψωσας σήμερον· ὡς γὰρ τῇ πλάνῃ ἄγαν ἀκρατῶς, ἡ φύσις προκατηνέχθη, παγκλήρως ἡμᾶς πάλιν ἀνώρθωσε, τὸ φῶς τὸ τοῦ Σταυροῦ σου· ὃν οἱ πιστοὶ μεγαλύνομεν.

Ἵνα τὸν τύπον ὑποδείξῃς, τῷ κόσμῳ προσκυνούμενον Κύριε, τὸν τοῦ Σταυροῦ ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς ἔνδοξον, ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐμόρφωσας, φωτὶ ἁπλέτῳ ἠγλαϊσμένον, Βασιλεῖ πανοπλίαν ἀήττητον· ἣν πᾶσαι αἱ Δυνάμεις, τῶν οὐρανῶν μεγαλύνουσιν.

1188. Θεοχάρης Δετοράκης, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ Μελῳδός, Βίος καὶ Ἔργο*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 28 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1979), 179–180.

ward for the explanation of the matter. Theodōros Prodromos[1189] expresses the opinion that Kosmas was obliged to add the new heirmos and the three troparia in order with them to cover subjects that had not been touched in the preceding troparia of the canon ("since he also still observed many sayings and subjects also having reference to the cross that remained unrecorded in them, not tolerating these things to suffer loss, he was obliged to double the ninth ode...in order while it also celebrated the Mother of God in twofold songs, at the same time it was expanded in accounts concerning the cross").[1190] In any case, this is not precise because references already exist in the preceding troparia of the canon to the same subjects that are developed in these four troparia. One biographer of the Saint, Iōannēs IX Merkouropolos, patriarch of Jerusalem (1156–1165), attributes the doubling of the ninth ode to a practical need, since during its chanting the kissing of the cross was done, and time was not sufficient ("in order that the music was sufficient until the people are sanctified by the cross. In this manner, the addition of the hymns took place.")[1191] However, a kissing of the precious cross during the chanting of the ninth ode is not attested to by the sources. Finally, Iōannēs Zōnaras and Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain in their commentaries refer to a life of Kosmas, of an anonymous author, full of imaginary and ahistorical elements. The anonymous author gives a mythical and quite childish explanation. Kosmas ostensibly heard his canon being incorrectly chanted in the Monastery

1189. Theodōros Prodromos (Θεόδωρος Πρόδρομος), was a twelfth century poet laureate at the Byzantine imperial court whose diverse and versatile works enjoyed popularity, Alexander Kazhdan, "Prodromos, Theodore," *ODB* 3:1726–1727. His poetic work is examined in Wolfram Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*, Wiener Byzantinistiche Studien Band XI (Vienna: Verlag der Österrichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1974).

1190. Henricus Stevenson, ed., *Theodori Prodromi Commentarios in carmina sacra melodorum Cosmae Hierosolymitani et Ioannis Damasceni ad fidem codd. mss. primum editit et varietate lectionis instruxit in Quinquagesimum Sacerdotii Natalem Leonis XIII Pont. Max.*, (Rome: Ex Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1888), 27.

1191. Θεοχάρης Δετοράκης, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ Μελῳδός, Βίος καὶ Ἔργο*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 28 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1979), 60; cf. the text in Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 4:338, 18–20.

of the Honorable Forerunner, of Antioch. He intervened and corrected the chanters but caused the anger and the reprimands of the abbot. He then was obliged to reveal his identity and, in order to prove himself indeed to be the composer of the canon, he composed the new heirmos and the three troparia of the second part of the ninth ode. This life is preserved in a manuscript also published about a hundred years ago by A. Papadopoulos–Kerameus in Petersburg (*Analects of a Jerusalemite Spicilegium*, vol. 4, pp. 271–302).[1192] The existence of three different explanations, none of which are satisfying, shows that no one really knew the reason for the existence of a double ninth ode in the present canon. For an unknown reason, Kosmas made the ninth ode a double heirmoi.[1193] Even perhaps for no reason at all, motivated by a playful mood. The same thing also applies to the hypothesis that the four troparia are a work of another later composer. However, this is rather unlikely.

Now as for the second part of the question.

And here matters are also not clear. The various old and modern Typika sidestep the question. But living tradition, from what I could gather, is split. It is only clear that when the canon is chanted, namely, on the feast of the Exaltation and in the days following the feast, at the end of the ninth ode both its heirmoi are chanted as katabasies. Namely, the question is limited to instances where only the katabasies of the Cross are chanted: August 1 and 6–13, as well as August 24–September 13, during the feasts and Sundays that fall in the above time periods. The liturgical books (Mēnaia, Heirmologia,

1192. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 4:271–302. The above account of the composition of the ninth ode is contained on p. 287, paragraph 18, where it is stated that Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain discovered an unpublished writing of Iōannēs Zōnaras. See Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Ἑορτοδρόμιον ἤτοι Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τοὺς Ἁσματικοὺς Κανόνας τῶν Δεσποτικῶν καὶ Θεομητορικῶν Ἑορτῶν, Συνερανισθὲν ἐκ διαφόρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Πατέρων, πλουτισθὲν μὲ πολλὰς σημειώσεις, καὶ συντεθὲν εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γλῶσσαν* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Τυπογραφίας Νικολάου Γλυκύ, 1836), 55. Iōannēs Zōnaras (Ἰωάννης Ζωναράς), death after 1159, was a historian, canonist, and theologian. See A. Kazhdan, "Zonaras, John," *ODB* 3:2229 and Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 656–659.

1193. "Γιὰ ἄγνωστο λόγο ὁ Κοσμᾶς ἔκανε δίερμο τὴν θ' ὠδή."

and so forth) also always have two heirmoi ("O Theotokos, you are a mystical paradise..." and "Through the fruit of the tree..."). It is obvious that no distinction is made between the katabasies of the feast of the Exaltation, those of the days following the feast, and the chanting of the katabasies of the days preceding the feast. The very conservative expert of the Typikon, the oikonomos Geōrgios Rēgas of eternal memory, confirms the same thing in his *Typikon*. According to him, the katabasia of the ninth ode of the Precious Cross is always chanted double.[1194] This appears to be the prevailing taxis on the Holy Mountain, although in the manuscript Typikon of the Hagioritic hieromonk Methodios (1890) it is noted that "only the first heirmos, namely, 'O Theotokos, you are a mystical paradise...' and nothing else" is chanted on August 1 and 6, while it is emphatically stated that both heirmoi are chanted for September 14.[1195]

It is not easy for anyone to know which practice is preferred in parish temples. It appears that there does not exist a consensus. In fact, if anyone judges by the *Calendar-Typika* circulating annually (some of which do not deal with this detail at all, others stipulate that both heirmoi of the ninth ode should be chanted, and others of which put only the first or both, but the second in brackets), one becomes certain of the multiplicity that prevails there as well.

Which is the correct practice? From what we saw, it became clear that there does not exist a consensus in the tradition. It appears that strictness requires in all instances the chanting of both heirmoi as katabasies. This is also the simplest thing. The chanting of only the first katabasia is probably owed to an effort for reducing the length of the service or to a pedantic and trifling speculation.

1194. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, ed., *Τυπικόν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1994), 95.

1195. Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 40 (September 14), 293 (August 1), 295 (August 6). The text of the answer contains a misprint for the year as 1860. The year 1890 is the date of the Typikon.

576

"That your holy name may remain 'ἀνεξάρνητον' or 'ἀνεξάρτητον' on him"?[1196]

And again, the question is posed regarding which is the correct reading in the text of the prayer of the eighth day from the birth of the child; "may remain ἀνεξάρνητον..." or "may remain ἀνεξάρτητον...." The difference between the two words consists in one letter: "ν" or "τ." We wrote regarding this topic in one of the first answers, number twelve. We are referring to it because it is not worthwhile for what we wrote at that time to be repeated. We are summarizing and adding some interesting supplementary elements.

The first reading ("ἀνεξάρτητον") is encountered in modern printed editions and originates either from a misprint or from a poor correction of the correct word "ἀνεξάρνητον" by some careless proofreader. Thus, it also passed on into other printed editions that are still used in divine worship by certain priests. Fortunately, it has already been corrected in modern editions. There is nothing left but for those who have older editions in use to correct it because this is an indisputable and serious mistake. The reason for a "ν" or "τ" can appear "pedantic" and "insignificant," but the corruption of the text is substantial. This will be seen from the following.

According to the lexica of the Greek language, the adjective, "ἀνεξάρτητος -η -ο(ν)," a modern word, means a person not dependent on another, independent, one who acts of their own will, free, and so forth.

"Ἀνεξάρνητος," a medieval word, denotes one who does not deny, does not renounce something. It appears that it is rarely used and always in ecclesiastical texts, with precisely the same meaning. The Christian bears the name of Christ and cannot or must not deny it, but up until the last drop of blood and death must remain faithful to the Christian faith and confession. This can be related to texts of the New Testament, on which it also obviously depends, such as:

1196. "'Ἀνεξάρνητον' or 'ἀνεξάρτητον' μεῖναι τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν."

"whoever denies me[1197] before human beings, I also will deny[1198] him before my Father…" (Matthew 10:33), "he who denies me[1199]…will be denied[1200]…" (Luke 12:9), "he has denied[1201] the faith and is worse than an unbeliever" (1 Timothy 5:9), "if we shall deny[1202] him, that one will also deny[1203] us" (2 Timothy 2:12), "denying[1204] the Master who bought them" (1 Peter 2:1), "denying[1205] our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude 4), "you did not deny[1206] my faith" (Revelation 2:13), "you did not deny[1207] my name" (Revelation 3:8), and others.

It is encountered in the most ancient Christian texts with the same meaning and within a similar phraseological framework, such in the *Apostolic Constitutions* ("Those who are persecuted on account of the faith…that they maintain not denied the name of Christ in themselves," Epitome of Book Eight 27.1,[1208] and "denying devotion to God because of weakness of character and fear of a most brief punishment…," 5.6.5[1209]), in the philosopher and martyr Justin ("up until death we are not deniers of His name," *Dialogue with Trypho* 30.2.4),[1210] in the *Acts of John* ("for an undeniable testimony

1197. "ἀρνήσηταί με."
1198. "ἀρνήσομαι."
1199. "ἀρνησάμενός με."
1200. "ἀπαρνηθήσεται."
1201. "ἤρνηται."
1202. "ἀρνούμεθα."
1203. "ἀρνήσεται."
1204. "ἀρνούμενοι."
1205. "ἀρνούμενοι."
1206. "ἠρνήσω."
1207. "ἠρνήσω."
1208. "Τοὺς διωκομένους διὰ πίστιν…ἵνα ἀνεξάρνητον ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ διατηρήσωσιν." *Epitome of Book Eight of the Apostolic Constitutions* 27.1 in Francis Xaver Funk, ed., *Testamonia et Scripturae Propinquae*, vol. 2 of *Didaskalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn: In Libraria Ferdinandi Schoeningh, 1905), 91. Compare *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.45.1 (SC 336:263–264).
1209. "ἐξαρνησάμενοι τὴν εὐσέβειαν διὰ γνώμης χαυνότητα καὶ φόβον βραχυτάτης τιμωρίας…." *Apostolic Constitutions* 5.6.5 (SC 329:216).
1210. "μέχρι θανάτου ἀνεξαρνήτους ἡμᾶς γίνεσθαι τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ." Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 30.2.4 in E.J. Goodspeed, eds., *Die ältesten Apologeten: Text mit kurzen Einleitungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915), 123.

of death," 9),[1211] in the Martyrion of Saint Kōnon ("to hymn and glorify without denial," 5.3.3.),[1212] in Athanasios the Great ("the Church not denying," *Homily on the holy Fathers and Prophets* 8),[1213] and in Eusebios of Caesarea ("while my way of life according to God remains not denied…," 10.11.35).[1214]

In the prayer "for the sealing of a child when it receives a name on the eighth day after its birth,"[1215] we find the adjective "ἀνεξάρνητον" ("that your holy name may remain ἀνεξάρνητον [not denied] on him") with the same meaning that we find it both in biblical references and in the Fathers as well as in other statements by the old

---

1211. "εἰς ἀνεξάρνητον μαρτύριον τοῦ θανάτου." Acts of John 9 in Maximilianus Bonnet, ed., *Passio Andreae, Exactis Andreae Martyria Andreae, Acta Andreae et Matthiae, Acta Petri et Andreae, Passio Bartholomaei, Acta Ioannis, Martyrium Matthaei*, partis alterius, volume prius of *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, ed.* Constantinus Tischendorf, Ricardus Adelbertus Lipsius, and Maximilianus Bonnet (Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1898), 157. Translation from Bernard Pick, *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew, and Thomas* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1909), 132.

1212. "ὑμνεῖν καὶ δοξάζειν ἀνεξαρνήτως." Phountoulēs appears to be using the text in Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 5:387. However, while the paragraph reference (5) is identical, the other numerical references do not appear to correspond to line numbers. For an extensive study of this early Christian martyr from Asia Minor, see Philipp Pilhofer, ed., *Das Martyrium des Konon von Bidana in Isaurien: Einleitung, Text, und Überstzung*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschicte der altchristlichen Literatur Band 188 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020).

1213. "ἀνεξάρνητος Ἐκκλησία." PG 28:1072a. Phountoulēs cited the column in Patrologia Migne as a reference number in the text. The paragraph number of the homily is substituted above.

1214. "…μενούσης μοι τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν πολιτείας ἀνεξαρνήτου." Eusebios of Caesarea, *Preparation for the Gospel* 10.11.35 in Karl Mras, ed., *Die Preparatio Evangelica*, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte, Eusebius Werke, vol. 8, part 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954), 601. Eusebios is quoting an oration of the second century theologian Tatian.

1215. "εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ κατασφραγίσαι παιδίον, λαμβάνον ὄνομα τῇ ὀγδοῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτοῦ." The word "seal" (σφραγίς) and associated terms can refer to the sign of the cross traced on a person or to an anointing. In this case, the title of the rite is referring to the "signing" or tracing of the form of the cross and not an anointment. For a brief discussion of this use, see Byron David Stuhlman, *The Initiatory Process in the Byzantine Tradition, Texts in Translation from Early Manuscripts of the Euchology and Typikon of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, with a brief commentary*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 18 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009), 17.

ecclesiastical writers that we mentioned above. This is also a case here of a very old prayer, which was read to the catechumens on the day of their registration in the relevant church lists. From that moment, they were Christian catechumens. We pray that the name of Christ (which thereafter they bore) remains "not denied"[1216] by them. After the prevalence of infant baptism, from the influence of the Old Testament and of Judaic practice concerning the eighth day circumcision (see also Luke 1:59–63 and 2:21) and since precisely a mention is made in the prayer regarding a name, the prayer became associated with the eighth day from the birth of the child and its naming. Indeed, the prayer refers to the name of Christ – a Christian, but in any case, to something related.[1217]

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki gives a brief summary and a short commentary on the prayer "for making a catechumen"[1218] which prefaces the exorcisms that precede holy baptism ("In your name, O Lord of Truth…").[1219] Regarding content, this is related to the prayer of the eighth day and Symeōn makes a connection between the two, indeed also using the adjective at issue, "ἀνεξάρνητον." "And the first prayer is in the name of the Trinity. For by this prayer, he is entrusted to God alone and is sanctified through it. And the prayer entreats that the name of the Trinity may remain not denied (ἀνεξάρνητον) in the one being baptized and that this one might be perfected by divine baptism, chrismation, and sacred communion" (*Dialogue*, chapter 62).[1220] A more extensive commentary on the naming and the prayer of the eighth day is done in chapters 59 and 60 of the *Dialogue*. However, the term "ἀνεξάρνητος" is not mentioned.

1216. "ἀνεξάρνητον."

1217. The sentence appears to be fragmented and perhaps a misprint. The author was probably emphasizing the connection of the name of Christ and that of the Christian who should never deny the Lord.

1218. "εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον."

1219. "Ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας…"

1220. PG 155:217a.

577

During the chanting of the troparia, "Isaiah dance..."[1221] and so forth, in the service of marriage and the three circles that are done during it, does the priest who leads hold the Gospel book with his right hand and the newlyweds with his left hand or only the newlyweds?

According to contemporary practice, which is the one commonly, as it appears, prevalent, the priest during the sacred dance of marriage holds the Gospel book with the one hand and the newlyweds with the other. Thus, Christ, who is symbolized by the sacred Gospel book, in some manner is leading this sacred "dance,"[1222] as the sources name it, which constitutes one of the most festive elements and, together with the crowning, the most popular display in the service of marriage. As is well known, "Χορεύω τὸν Ἡσαΐα" (I am dancing Isaiah's dance)[1223] in the language of the people is synonymous with "τελῶ γάμο"[1224](παντρεύομαι, I am getting married).[1225]

However, it is true that neither the standard rubrics of the printed editions and the Euchologia in use nor the manuscripts expressly state whether or not the priest holds the Gospel book during the sacred dance. For example, the majority of manuscripts nearly stereotypically repeat that the priest "makes an entrance (εἰσοδεύει) with them [the newlyweds] three times [or "thrice"] while chanting"[1226] or "he makes them go in a circle three times,"[1227] while the priest and the people chant "Holy Martyrs...,"[1228] or "Isaiah dance...," or "Glory to you, O Christ God...,"[1229] (or either two or all three of the above troparia, according to local variations). It is not said whether

1221. "Ἡσαΐα χόρευε..."
1222. "χορείας."
1223. This is a colloquial expression referring to the troparion sung during the circular procession of the newlyweds in the marriage service. Customarily, the "dance" is viewed as their first steps as a married couple.
1224. The literal translation is, "I celebrate a marriage."
1225. Phountoulēs provides this parenthetical as the translation of the second colloquial expression.
1226. "εἰσοδεύει αὐτούς [τοὺς νεονύμφους] τρίς (ἤ τρίτον) ψάλλων."
1227. "γυρίζει αὐτοὺς γ'."
1228. "Ἅγιοι Μάρτυρες..."
1229. "Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός..."

the priest holds the Gospel book. Indeed, on the contrary, it appears that some manuscripts indirectly preclude it. Thus, according to the *Codex Athens 829*, as is implied, the priest holds the newlyweds with both his hands, "by the hands, since they are entwined, and he makes them go in a circle."[1230] According to other manuscripts, the priest holds the newlyweds, obviously, with the left hand, and "a censer with incense"[1231] with the right (*Athens 849, M. Lavras Λ 105, Pan. Taphou 615*). It can be explained that this latter example is due to the influence of the parallel practice during the sacred dance in the mystery of holy baptism, during which the priest censes around the font. However, perhaps it is also an influence of the practice of the processions because certainly also in both the cases of baptism and marriage the processional character of their circular movements is obvious. From an influence of the practice of the procession can likewise also be explained the fact that the priest holds the Gospel book. And in the processions, as is well known, the Gospel book is carried in a representation of Christ. But also, the term "εἰσοδεύειν" (to make an entrance, to enter), which we saw above is used by the standard rubrics to denote the sacred dance ("the newlyweds make an entrance,"[1232] "he makes an entrance with them thrice"[1233]), can perhaps be illuminating regarding the influence of the entrance of Vespers or of the Liturgy on the sacred dance. The entrance is done either "with the Gospel book" or "with a censer."

With great rigor, the protopresbyter Evangelos Mantzouneas of eternal memory speaks against priests, who hold the Gospel book during the sacred dance. He views this as an "error of enormous dimensions." He writes word-for-word: "After the common cup, the priest takes the newlyweds and...circles around the table, chanting 'Isaiah dance.' Certain priests wrongly hold the sacred Gospel book in their hands, because around whom are they circling? Around a common table. And this is an error of enormous dimensions. Consequently, the sacred Gospel book should remain on the table" (*Tele-*

1230. "ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν, ὡς εἰσὶ πεπλεγμένοι καὶ γυρίζει αὐτούς."
1231. "θυμιατὸν μετὰ θυμιάματος."
1232. "εἰσοδεύουσιν οἱ νεόνυμφοι."
1233. "εἰσοδεύει αὐτοὺς τρίτον."

turgics, Athens 1989, p. 291).[1234] However, it escaped his attention that it is not attested that the sacred dance is done around the Gospel book or even around the table or folding stand on which the Gospel book was found. Those manuscripts that provide for the sacred dance for the service of marriage make mention of an entrance "as in a form of a circle"[1235] or of "three rounds"[1236] that take place "inside the temple,"[1237] "in a circle in the place where they stood,"[1238] namely, before the beautiful gate on the solea or more clearly, "in front of or behind the holy icons," [1239] namely, the proskynētaria where they were at that time, as nowadays in the monasteries, on the solea very close to the templon (*M. Lavras Θ 88*). The benediction of marriage was still associated with the Divine Liturgy or communion from the Presanctified Elements, and the future spouses stood on the solea before the beautiful gate, but the Gospel book, the crowns, and the Holy Elements or the common cup were placed on the holy table.

Later manuscripts prescribe that the sacred dance is done "in a circle of the stand"[1240] or around "the four-legged table"[1241] (*Athens 829, Patriarchate of Alexandria 1070*). The separation from the Divine Liturgy is complete, and marriage is celebrated in the center of the temple, where a stand or table is placed, or even in homes. However, also again the rubric refers to the place where "they make

---

1234. Εὐάγγελος Μαντζουνέας, *Τελετουργική* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1989), 291. Phountoulēs cited the publication date as 1990, but the correct date is 1989. The protopresbyter Evangelos Mantzouneas was a canonist, author of canonical studies and reference books, and secretary of the Church of Greece's synodal committee on nomocanonical questions.

1235. "ὡς ἐν σχήματι κύκλου."

1236. "γύρους γ'."

1237. "ἔνδον τοῦ ναοῦ."

1238. "γύρωθεν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ἵσταντο."

1239. "ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων."

1240. "γύρωθεν τοῦ ἀναλογίου." Although normally transliterated as "analogion," "τοῦ ἀναλογίου" here is translated as "stand" to avoid the word's modern association with the "chanting stand," an often multi-sided slanted stand incorporating shelving space for the storage of liturgical books for the reader and chanter.

1241. "ἀπὸ τὸ τετράποδον."

circles while both dancing and chanting troparia…"[1242] (*Athens 664*) and do not refer to the Gospel book.

From all the above, I think that it has become quite clear that the contemporary practice is good. This practice is not contradicted by the older relevant tradition, which is inferred, even indirectly, from the standard rubrics of the codices.

The sacred circular dance in the service does not acquire meaning because it is done around the table with the Gospel book, but it has meaning by itself as an expression of joy and gladness of the newlyweds and the entire Christian community, according to age-old, universal, and yet contemporary customs. But if the meaning of a journey towards eternity and the endless joy of the Kingdom of God is given to these three circles, as modern theologians comment, then the leading of the procession by the priest with the sacred Gospel book—a representation of Christ—acquires a particular theological meaning.[1243] The commentary of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki is also similar: "And immediately he [the priest] taking them [the newlyweds] by the hand, leads them towards the altar and does the dance, while gladdened in Christ he sings with the chanters, 'Holy Martyrs,' just as in the case of ordination, and says, 'Glory to you, O Christ God, boast of the apostles.' For they who live piously and chastely are companions of Christ and his saints, also because they must be joined not in flesh alone but much more in soul by both

1242. "ποιοῦσι γύρους καὶ χορεύοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες τροπάρια…"

1243. Namely, that the spouses might experience the joy of the Kingdom of Heaven and not an "eternal" marriage. In the betrothal service, the Church prays, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτούς [αὐτῶν ἢ αὐτοῖς] εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους" (That these [their (αὐτῶν or αὐτοῖς)] entrances and departures be blessed). In other liturgical uses, the "entrances and departures" (εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους) refer to entrances into life through birth and departures by death, such as in the third prayer from the Vespers for Pentecost, "Σοὶ χάριν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὁμολογοῦμεν, ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰσόδοις ἡμῶν ταῖς εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον, καὶ ταῖς ἐξόδοις, αἳ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἡμῶν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς ἀκηράτου ζωῆς, διὰ τῆς σῆς ἀψευδοῦς ἐπαγγελίας προμνηστεύονται" (We confess your grace for all things, for our entrances into this world, and departures, which obtain our hope of resurrection and unfading life through your certain promise). With regard to the "entrances and departures" (εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους) of the petition above, these terms most likely refer to the entrance of the betrothed into their new life as spouses and their future departure from the marital union through death.

their correct faith and God-pleasing works of piety in order also that the wedlock might be true and marriage undefiled and that they might be companions of Christ and of his saints" (*Dialogue*, chapter 282).[1244] The taxis nowadays has somewhat changed. However, the meaning always remains the same.

1244. PG 155:513b–513c. On the meaning of the phrase "they must be joined not in flesh alone but much more in soul by both their correct faith and God-pleasing works of piety," see the discussion of a similar meaning of the nuptial union in the writings of Theodōros Balsamōn (d. after 1195) as outlined by Patrick Viscuso, "Canonical Reflections on Clergy and Marriage," in *Married Priests in the Catholic Church*, ed. Adam A. J. Deville (Notre Dame, IN: The University of Notre Dame Press, 2021), 57–62. The discussion and text cited above by Phountoulēs do not imply belief in an "eternal marriage," a modern theological opinion, but rather a view of marriage as a journey towards a salvation in which "they [the spouses] might be companions of Christ and of his saints." The Church does not have a doctrinal teaching that marriage is an eternal union existing beyond death. Such an opinion is inconsistent with its canonical practice of permitted remarriage after divorce and the death of a spouse. In explaining such unions, some modern proponents of "eternal union" take the extreme view of relegating all remarriage to a non-sacramental status in contradiction to the full communion of the second married, signifying their ecclesial standing (even during periods of Church history when such couples were initially penanced after the remarriage). In addition, proponents of this theory have difficulties with scriptural passages such as Luke 20:34–36, Mark 12:22–25, and Romans 7:2, as well as traditional and patristic commentary on these texts. Examples of such commentaries include that of Theophylaktos (Hēphaistos) (Θεοφύλακτος [Ἥφαιστος]) of Ochrid (born mid-eleventh century–d. after 1125), on Mark 12:22–25 (PG 123:625d–628a): "For there will be a resurrection from the dead, but not to carnality, but to a divine angelic kind of life. Since we will be incorruptible, and will remain forever the same, there will be no marriage. Now, because we are corruptible, there is marriage, so that, by joining together for continuance of the human race we do not become extinct. But then, just as the angels are without the need for marital procreation because they remain the same and never come to an end, so too the resurrected will remain undiminished in number, and there will be no need for marriage," translation from Christopher Sade, trans., *The Explanation by Blessed Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrid and Bulgaria of the Holy Gospel According to Saint Mark* (House Springs, MO: Chrysostom Press, 2000), 105. In any case, not one canon in the formal corpus of Orthodox canon law or any work of Orthodox canon law contains a doctrine of a so-called "eternal marriage." In setting forth the main points of belief and canonical practice regarding matrimony, the common document on the subject promulgated by the 2016 Holy and Great Council contains no mention of the marital union as eternal. In general, this theological opinion does not appear to predate the twentieth century and most likely originated in the Russo-Byzantine school of

578

When and why is the gospel reading of Matins read after the anabathmoi and when after the katabasies?

The service of the monastic Matins according to Jerusalemite Typikon of Saint Sabas, which is nowadays observed in the monasteries and in the parish temples of the Orthodox Church, consists of two clearly distinct parts. The first part contains the nocturnal chanting, the ancient Midnight Office, which consists of the Six Psalms and the two or three kathismata of the Psalter, to which during Sundays and feasts the amōmos or polyeleos is added accordingly. Synaptes, troparia, and readings are intercalated between them. The second part, the ancient early morning chanting,[1245] contains the fiftieth psalm, the stichologia of the odes, lauds, and the doxology. Between these two modules during Sundays and feasts, the reading of the Matins gospel is inserted, which is preceded by the chanting of the anabathmoi (only of the first antiphon of the fourth tone during feasts), a movable–alternating prokeimenon, and an invariable prokeimenon, "Let everything that has breath...."[1246] From the *Peregrinatio* of Aetheria, we have testimony that the first part of the service was independently conducted outside of the temple of the Resurrection and concluded with the reading of the gospel pericope before the koubouklion of the All-holy Tomb by the patriarch himself.[1247] The second part was celebrated later within the temple.

---

theology centered at Institut de théologie orthodoxe Saint-Serge in Paris. The late Very Rev. Dr. John Meyendorff of Saint Vladimir's Seminary popularized this opinion in the English-speaking world.

1245. "ἡ ἀρχαία ὀρθρινὴ ψαλμωδία."

1246. "Πᾶσα πνοή..."

1247. The order of services described in this work and their relation to the "asmatic" vigil are extensively discussed by Juan Mateos, "La vigile cathédrale chez Egérie," *OCP* 27 (1961): 281-312 and Robert Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 48–55. This fourth century writing is a travelogue of a woman's pilgrimage to Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor. The writing is divided into two parts: a diary of the pilgrimage and a description of services in Jerusalem. Phountoulēs's attribution and titling of this work (Ὁδοιπορικὸν τῆς Αἰθερίας, *Peregrinatio* of Aetheria) reflect the scholarly discussion at the time of his writing. Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship to a writer

Consequently, the insertion of the gospel pericope at this point of the service must have its origin in this old practice of the Church of Jerusalem or must be owed to an influence of the taxis of the "asmatic" parish Pannychis,[1248] in which the reading of the gospel is surrounded by a framework analogous to that of the present festal Matins. This is the original position of the gospel reading of Matins that is attested to by all the old and modern Typika, which follow the monastic Typikon, and is observed in the monasteries and in the parish temples.

In this taxis, there exists an exception. During the service of the Matins of Great Saturday (of the Epitaphios), the gospel is read at the end of the service, after the doxology and the procession attached to it (a procession of the epitaphios). Here, this is a case of an influence of a practice of the "asmatic"/parish Matins, in which the gospel was read by the priest from the ambōn, precisely after the doxology and the troparion that concluded it ("Today salvation…,"[1249] or "Arising from the tomb…"[1250] during Sundays).

And there did not exist a problem for the monasteries. The monks are attending church from the enarxis of the service. However, in the parishes, an essential pastoral need was sensed. The reading of the gospel was done very early, and the people attended church later. Let it be noted that the omission of the kathismata of the Psalter is quite an old parish custom. On the other hand, for a long period,

---

known as Egeria and titles the work *Itinerarium Egeriae*. Speculation regarding the author's homeland includes Aquitaine, Gallia Narbonensis, southern Gaul, and Galicia. Aside from recently discovered fragments, the work is contained in one surviving eleventh century manuscript, the *Codex Aretinus 405*. This discussion is based on the Anne McGowan and Paul F. Bradshaw, trans., *The Pilgrimage of Egeria, A New Translation of the Itinerarium Egeriae with Introduction and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press Academic, 2018) and George E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*, Ancient Christian Writers, no. 38 (New York: Newman Press, 1970). Additional information may be found in John Wilkinson, trans., *Egeria's Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1999) and Victor Parra-Guinaldo, "Itinerarium Egeriae: A Retrospective Look and Preliminary Study of a New Approach to the Issue of Authorship-provenance," *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 7 (2019): 13–21.

1248. "παννυχίς."

1249. "Σήμερα σωτηρία…"

1250. "Ἀναστὰς ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος…"

partly up until nowadays, the chanting of the canons was preserved (the stichologia of the odes in the parishes had itself also rather early fallen into disuse), which took quite some time, in any case much longer than the Six Psalms and the troparia-kathismata at the beginning of Matins.[1251] Thus, acquiescing[1252] to the weakness of the people, who attended the synaxis partially and late, a way for a relative remedy of the matter at first informally, and later more officially, was found by the transfer of the gospel reading. Our first known witness for this is provided by the Typikon of the prōtopsaltēs Kōnstantinos (1838).[1253] The transfer was made to a strange place between the eighth and ninth ode of the canons. The canons were still chanted and the time gain that resulted from this transfer was probably more than half an hour. Later, because the canons began to be read or even omitted, or at least most of their odes, the time gain was negligible, but the transfer had already become solidified. Thus, the new taxis became prevalent, which was fortunately confined only to the Sunday eōthinon gospel reading. The anabathmoi and the first prokeimenon (movable) remained in their original and correct position, the second prokeimenon (invariable) together with the gospel reading, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...,"[1254] the fiftieth psalm, and the special synaptē, were detached from there and transferred between the eighth and ninth odes of the canon, or, more precisely, after the katabasia of the eighth ode and prior to the ninth biblical ode ("More honorable than the Cherubim...")[1255] and its katabasia. It had already become prevalent for the katabasies to be chanted all together, separately from the odes of the canon and after the kontakion, the oikos, and the hypomnēma[1256] of the Mēnologion.

1251. The truncating of the elements led to the gospel reading being done earlier and, with the late attendance of the people, not being heard.

1252. "συγκαταβαίνοντας."

1253. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὸ ὕφος τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Constantinople: ἐκ τῆς Τυπογραφίας τῶν Ἀδελφῶν Ἰγνατιαδῶν, 1838), 2.

1254. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."

1255. "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν τῶν Χερουβίμ..."

1256. "ὑπόμνημα." An extract from the Mēnologion or Synaxarion by which the feast or commemoration of the day is made known.

Thus, two "taxeis" of an eōthinon gospel or gospel of Matins developed:

1) The ancient and correct one, which is always observed in monasteries and only during the Matins of feasts in parishes, and contains after the kathismata, the anabathmoi (or the first antiphon of the fourth tone during feasts), the first prokeimenon, the invariable prokeimenon ("Let everything that has breath...."), the gospel reading, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." (during Sundays, the period of Pascha, and the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross), the fiftieth psalm, the special synaptē ("Save, O God, your people..."),[1257] and the canons in due order.

2) The modern one, which is observed in parishes only during Sundays and, after the kathismata, provides for the anabathmoi, the first prokeimenon, the canons, the katabasies up until the eighth ode, the invariable prokeimenon, the gospel reading, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...," the fiftieth psalm, "Save, O God, your people," the ninth ode, the exaposteilarion, and the remaining elements of Matins. We previously characterized this modern taxis for Sundays as "strange," to use this term lightly, because the detachment of the gospel reading from its old position was inappropriate, the separation of the gospel reading from the anabathmoi and its two prokeimena is incorrect, and the chanting of the fiftieth psalm as an introduction to the second part of Matins and of the stichologia of the odes and canons came with its transfer in reverse order. Likewise unfortunate was also the choice of its new position in a completely bizarre manner between the eighth and ninth odes or their katabasies.

But in any case, the choice was made, became prevalent, and created two taxeis for Sunday Matins without reason, as became apparent from later development, one for the parishes and one for the monasteries. Fortunately, the transfer was also not extended to the Matins gospels for feasts so that also here the tradition might be split.

1257. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου..."

For us to summarize:

Nowadays, we have two taxeis that pertain to the time for reading the Sunday eōthinon gospel.

1) The modern one, which is observed in parishes, and which transfers the second prokeimenon, the gospel reading, the fiftieth psalm, and the synaptē ("Save, O God, your people...") between the katabasies of the eighth and ninth ode ("More honorable").[1258]

2) The ancient one, which is observed in monasteries and in the Slavic churches on Sundays, during which the eōthinon gospel is read in its place, namely, after the anabathmoi and the two prokeimena, and naturally, prior to the canons. In parish temples and monasteries, the gospel reading for the Matins of feasts is read in the same place.

Let it be noted that this old taxis for the Sunday eōthinon gospel is also observed in parishes in some places, when a hierarch is about to celebrate Liturgy. And this ancient taxis is certainly preferable, as long as the gospel reading is not hastily said and the chanting of the fiftieth psalm and the kissing of the Gospel book are not done in a disorderly manner due to the expected arrival of the hierarch. Its preservation in this case is due to the conservatism of the hierarchical practice and Liturgy well-known from other examples.

As for the place of the Matins gospel reading, we noted above that according to the ancient "asmatic" parish Typikon, its reading was done from the ambōn, by the priest, and at the end of Matins, after the doxology, "Today salvation..." or "Arising from the tomb...," and the prokeimenon, "Arise, O Lord my God..."[1259] (on Sundays). The ektenēs, the plērōtika, and the dismissal followed after the gospel reading, just as it is precisely preserved in the Matins of Great Saturday. The "asmatic" practice and its survival on Great Saturday could constitute a model for a more correct, traditional, and practical transfer of the eōthinon gospel, if such an issue were ever raised.

Furthermore, finally, let it be noted that in the services of Matins for the first days of Great Week, we have gospel readings, without movable/alternating or invariable prokeimena, between the kathis-

1258. "Τιμιωτέρας."

1259. "Ἀνάστηθι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου..."

mata (up until also Great Wednesday) and the fiftieth psalm, after which the triōdia, the diōdion of Great Tuesday, or the canon of Great Thursday are chanted. But in the canons of the Paraklēsis, which imitate the structure of Matins, we have a gospel reading in a likewise "strange" place, between the sixth and seventh odes of the canon, after the kontakion and anabathmoi, with a movable prokeimenon (here it becomes invariable, "I will remember your name..."[1260]), but "Glory both now,"[1261] the troparia–pentēkostaria, and special synaptē ("Save, O God, your people) follow, while the fiftieth psalm remained to be read in its place, namely, prior to the canon. This is a rather inexplicable peculiarity but related to the transfer of the eōthinon gospel between the eighth and ninth odes of the katabasies.

579

During the Vespers for the Sunday of Pascha ("ἀγάπη," love), the gospel reading is customarily read in different languages by clergy or even by laity. In the various translations, "And that we may be deemed worthy to hear...,"[1262] precedes as the first stasis. Must this be said by all, or must they begin from "On the evening..."[1263]?

Indeed, the gospel reading is read in various languages for the Vespers of Pascha, which describes the first appearance of the Lord after the Resurrection to the ten disciples (John 20:19–25), which took place during the evening ("οὔσης ὀψίας") of the "first day of the week,"[1264] namely, of that Sunday, at the same time that, at least by inference, the service of Vespers is celebrated or ought to be celebrated. Where, when, and why this custom began to be done and how it became prevalent is not a subject for the present time. However, it is a fact that where these translations are published, frequently not in offi-

1260. "Μνησθήσομαι τοῦ ὀνόματός σου..."
1261. "Δόξα καὶ νῦν".
1262. "Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ἡμᾶς..."
1263. "Οὔσης ὀψίας..." (John 20:19).
1264. "μιᾶς τῶν Σαββάτων," (John 20:19).

cial but in ancillary books,[1265] at the outset they not only contain the text of the pericope, but also the introductory elements that are said by the deacon and priest according to the taxis ("And that we may be deemed worthy to hear...," "Wisdom, arise...,"[1266] "Peace be to all. The reading is from the Gospel according to John...,"[1267] "Let us attend"[1268]), not however also the responses of the people to these elements ("Lord have mercy, three times. And with your spirit. Glory to you, O Lord, glory to you.").[1269] It is also so published in the recent, especially well-prepared edition of Holy and Great Week by the Apostlikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece (pp. 378–398), which was done in 1985, with an introduction and editing of the text by the protopresbyter Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs, well-known for his excellent record of printed editions of liturgical books and his profound studies of liturgical taxis and strictness.[1270] But in practice we indeed hear priests, deacons, or even, as is customary, lay readers of the pericope recite the gospel passage in four staseis, including also the introductory elements ("And that we may be deemed worthy to hear...," "On the evening...,"[1271] "Therefore, Jesus said to them...,"[1272] "But Thomas..."[1273]), as likewise it is heard—I think more rarely—for the introductory elements to be said by the deacon and, on occasion, the priest first in rank or hierarch, and the recitation according to staseis to begin from "On the evening...." The question refers to this double practice. It is obvious that one of the two practices is the correct one. Let us discuss it.

1265. These books contain portions or full texts of services and are meant to help worshippers in following the celebrations.

1266. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί."

1267. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι. Ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην..."

1268. "Πρόσχωμεν."

1269. "Κύριε ἐλέησον γ'. Καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου. Δόξα σοι, Κύριε, δόξα σοι..."

1270. Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαγιάννης, ed., *Ἡ Ἁγία καὶ Μεγάλη Ἑβδομὰς περιέχουσα πᾶσας τὰς ἱερὰς ἀκολουθίας ἀπὸ τῆς Κυριακῆς τῶν Βαΐων μέχρι τῆς Κυριακῆς τοῦ Πάσχα* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1985), 378–398. Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs (1929–2014).

1271. "Οὔσης ὀψίας..." (John 20:19).

1272. "Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς..." (John 20:21).

1273. "Θωμᾶς δέ..." (John 20:24).

In the first place, if the second, third, and any remaining readers of the pericope are deacons or even laity, it is improper for them to say the words of the blessing in the first section, namely, "Peace be to all."[1274] But even still assuming that they are priests, as often occurs in big cities, it is once again unfitting for them to say, "Peace be to all,"[1275] even if they do not bless—which in this case they do not. The blessing is given once at the beginning by the priest first in rank or the bishop. But even the exhortations for the hearing of the sacred text ("And that...," "Wisdom, arise...," "Let us attend") are said one time only and not as many times as the languages of the texts. In this manner, they lose their meaning and trivialize liturgical practice. The same thing does not also happen for the title of the reading ("The reading is from the Gospel according to John..."—without "Let us attend"). Assuming that in the congregation there exist people who do not understand Greek, or even if they know Greek, are given the joy of hearing the "splendid"[1276] news of "the Resurrection" in their mother tongue—so it appears that this custom began—and the reading of the gospel is not done in many languages simply for reasons of celebration and for the creation of a festive atmosphere, then certainly it makes sense for it to be identified from which evangelist the pericope comes from. Then the first section could begin from, "The reading is from the Gospel according to John...." But this would certainly complicate matters for no serious reason because the truth is that the multilingual reading does not aim at and serve any practical purpose.

For all the reasons above, I think that the correct practice is for only three staseis of the pericope to be read ("On the evening...," "Therefore, Jesus said to them...," "But Thomas...") in succession, as is done, without the preliminary elements for the reading, which according to the taxis must be said by the deacon and the priest first in rank or hierarch alone ("And that..." and so forth). But because

1274. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι."

1275. Phountoulēs is not referring to Christ's blessing in the pericope, "Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν" (Peace be to you) (John 20:19, 21). He is discussing the blessing given by the celebrant prior to the gospel reading, "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι."

1276. "φαιδρόν." This is a quotation from the Sunday resurrectional apolytikion in the fourth tone.

we are witnesses of the complications that sometimes occur when this correct manner is applied, namely, that some of the readers of the staseis in foreign languages read one stasis instead of another (usually the preceding one instead of the one following), it would be preferable in new printed editions for the translation of the section, "And that we may be deemed worthy to hear...," and so forth, not to be included, even in the rendering of the pericope in the heroic hexameter poem of Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain ("Ὄφρακε νωϊτέροισιν...").[1277] Thus, with a radical solution, any possibility of error would cease to exist.

580

Which Wednesday is fasting, the one prior to the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross (Wednesday of the Third Week of the Fast) or the one after it (Wednesday of the Fourth Week)?

At first glance, the question appears somewhat strange, if not pointless, because everyone knows that the Wednesdays of the entire year are fasting days, as well as the Fridays. The fast on these two days of the week replaced, already from the apostolic period, the corresponding fast of pious Jews, which was observed on Monday and Thursday (compare, "I fast twice a week" of the Pharisee of the parable, Luke 18:12). In one of the most ancient Christian texts, the *Didachē of the Twelve Apostles*, which dates to the beginnings of the second century AD, there exists the earliest witness regarding the already existing fast of these days, which is indeed presented as having replaced the Monday and Thursday fast of the "hypocrites": "Let

1277. Phountoulēs is referring to the rendering of the pericope as a poem in Homeric Greek by Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain. "Ὄφρακε νωϊτέροισιν..." is a translation of the beginning words of the exhortation, "And that we may be deemed...." The Homeric Greek version appears in Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Εἰς δόξαν Πατρός, Υἱοῦ, καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ. Ἐγχειρίδιον Συμβουλευτικόν, περὶ Φυλακῆς τῶν πέντε Αἰσθήσεων, τῆς τε Φαντασίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Νοός, καὶ Καρδίας. Καὶ περὶ τοῦ, ποῖαί εἰσιν αἱ πνευματικαί, καὶ οἰκεῖαι τοῦ Νοὸς ἡδοναί* (Vienna: Ἄνθιμος Γαζῆς, 1801), 300–301. In the prefixed title to the poem entitled, "Heroic Gospel for the Vespers of Holy and Great Pascha," Blessed Nikodēmos states that the rendering in hexameter is to be read "on this [day] by those who wish."

not your fasting be with the hypocrites, for they fast on Monday and Thursday of the week, but you shall fast Wednesday and Friday" (8.1).[1278] In the same manner and for the same reason, the replacement had taken place of the Judaic Sabbath with the "first day of the week,"[1279] the day of the Resurrection of the Lord, the Lord's Day (Revelation 1:10). In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a text from the end of the fourth century, the theological meaning of the fast of these two days is given with a reference to the Lord's Passions: "Let not your fast be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth day of the week. But you...the fourth and the day of preparation, because on the fourth day the judgment came forth against the Lord while Judas promised the betrayal for money and on the day of preparation, because the Lord suffered His Passion by a Cross under Pontius Pilate on this day" (7.23.1–2).[1280]

If this tradition concerning fasting already was in force by the apostolic period for the Wednesdays generally of the entire year, certainly the more so is it in force for the days of Great Lent, to which belong both Wednesdays of the question. Great Lent is the Church's preeminent fasting period and the same diet and guidance concerning fasting applies for all its weekdays from Monday up until Friday. Strictness, which is mandatorily observed in the sacred monasteries, requires monophagia, namely, one trapeza after the ninth hour of the day, and xerophagy, namely, the eating of food without oil. The consumption of wine and oil, as well as the offering of two trapezas, are reserved only for Saturdays and Sundays during fasting periods. Wednesdays and Fridays of Great Lent have an even more intense penitential character, since indeed during them the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is regularly provided, the celebration of which presupposes a complete abstinence from food and drink,

1278. *Didachē of the Twelve Apostles* 8.1 in *La doctrine des douze apôtres*, trans. and ed. Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, SC 248 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978),172.

1279. "μίαν Σαββάτων."

1280. *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.23.1–2 (SC 336:50–51). In the Greek language, the fourth day and the day of preparation refer to Wednesday and Friday respectively.

from supper of the previous day up until the afternoon hours, during which the Presanctified is normally celebrated.

According to the above, both Wednesdays of Great Lent for the weeks that contain the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, namely, the Wednesday of the Third Week and the Wednesday of the Fourth Week of the Fast, are also equally days of fasting for the same reason, just as also the remaining days of Lent. This is the only correct answer that anyone could give to the question above. Both are fasting.

However, the question is not so unfounded as it appears. It presupposes a real relaxation of the fasting practice, not of course in the monasteries, but certainly among Christians in the world, which is due either to reasons of health or, even generally, to a decline of the austerity of the old practice concerning fasting.

Christians, who possibly may not follow the traditional manner of diet for all the days of Lent, wonder on which of the two Wednesdays they ought to keep the fast that they do not already observe for various reasons throughout the entire period of Lent. Nevertheless, the perception that one of these two days has something more special and venerable, for which fasting is necessarily required, obviously remained in the consciousness of those asking. Previously, we had dealt with a similar question, which concerned fasting on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross. And this has the same cause as the present question, and despite seemingly self-evident, it concealed a real and profoundly pious concern (see the answer to question number 145).

Although, consequently, as to fasting, it does not appear that either of these Wednesdays have any difference between them or the other Wednesdays of the Fast, the Wednesday of the Fourth Week does have something liturgically special. It is "the Wednesday of the middle week of the Fast," the middle of the Lenten period in the wider sense, namely, if we include Great Week in the calculation. From this day, according to the relevant rubric, "diplokatēchoumena"[1281] begin during the Presanctifieds, namely, the petitions "for

1281. "διπλοκατηχούμενα." Literally "double petitions for the catechumens."

those preparing for illumination,"[1282] the diaconal petitions and the relevant prayer with its exclamation are added to the usual entreaties of the Church for the catechumens.[1283] Starting from this day, the special cycle of catechetical lessons began to operate for those catechumens about to be baptized during Great Saturday, namely, to use contemporary terms, a kind of "advanced catechism" or of "intensive tutorial lessons" for the initiation of prospective new Christians into the dogmas and the moral teaching of the Church.

In the Typikon of the Great Church of Saint Sophia of Constantinople, from the ninth century, which is preserved in the codices of *T. Staurou 40 and Patmos 2*, there exists a proclamation of the deacon to the people, with which he called on those concerned, obviously sponsors, to bring candidates for illumination, to enroll them in this cycle of intensive catechism:

> I prevail on your love, Christ-loving brethren, as many of you who have some who ought to approach for holy baptism, who know that the Resurrection of Christ approaches, from tomorrow bring them to our most Holy Church that they may receive the seal in Christ and for them to be watched over and catechized…As many who would endeavor to be brought after this week…we will not allow them to be accepted.[1284]

In our contemporary practice of our worship, the form and the framework remained, namely, the entreaties for the phōtizomenoi,[1285] but the essence disappeared because adult catechumens ceased to exist, and infant baptism became generally prevalent. However, this is not the case of a fossil, museum item, or a useless remnant of long-gone circumstances, but as a reminder for the Church of the correct route that the catechism of adults must follow, if such a need ever

1282. "ὑπὲρ τῶν πρὸς τὸ φώτισμα εὐτρεπιζομένων."

1283. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 343, n. 28.

1284. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2:38–39.

1285. "φωτιζόμενοι." In question 230, Phountoulēs defines them as, "'those who are preparing for illumination,' namely, those catechumens who from the middle of Great Lent were preparing to receive holy baptism during the vigil of Pascha."

presents itself. Unfortunately, when the attendance in great numbers of adult candidates for baptism began during modern times, it turned out that indifference and ignorance of the tradition and of the correct taxis have taken on pandemic proportions, despite our arrogant words that we are their custodians.[1286]

And something else. The Wednesday of the Fourth Week is elevated in the hymnography of the day as the exact midpoint of Great Lent, as its apex and the most significant milestone in the enumeration of the days of the Fast, which represents the middle of the world and of the time during which Christ was crucified. Namely, it has a correlation to the feast of Mid-Pentecost on the Wednesday of the fourth week from Pascha, which marks the middle of the days of the resurrectional period, from the day of the salvific Resurrection up until Pentecost. Certain troparia of the service are characteristic: "Furnished with the sail of the Cross… completing half, O Messiah Jesus God…"[1287] (canon, ode 3, second troparion), "…middle of the earth, O Lover of humankind, which we on the middle day of the fast…"[1288] (ode 9, first troparion), "Enduring the Cross and Passion in the middle of the earth…today in the middle of the fast…"[1289] (first stichēron, Vespers of Tuesday), "In the middle of the Fast…"[1290] (exaposteilarion), "Having completed half the path of the fast, which leads to your precious Cross…"[1291] (first aposti-

1286. Phountoulēs is probably referring to the waves of immigration from the former communist countries of Eastern Europe after the fall of the Soviet Union, especially from among the Greek-speaking populations in the region of Northern Epiros within Albania, which included many unbaptized adults who were subsequently baptized in Greece. He is emphasizing that contemporary processes in the Church of Greece were oriented towards infant baptism and not aligned with the ancient tradition of an adult catechumenate. In this respect, he is inferring that catechism was lacking and that baptisms occurred without adequate preparation, sometimes from the misplaced zeal on the part of clergy and laity (who were eager to be sponsors).

1287. "Σταυροῦ τῷ ἱστίῳ… ἐκμεσάσαντες, Μεσσία Ἰησοῦ…" There appears to be a poetic play on words between the sounds of "ἐκμεσάσαντες" and "Μεσσία."

1288. "… μέσον τῆς γῆς, φιλάνθρωπε, ὅπερ ἡμεῖς μεσασμῷ τῆς νηστείας…"

1289. "Μέσον γῆς ὑπέμεινας σταυρὸν καὶ πάθος…"

1290. "Μεσότητι τῶν νηστειῶν…"

1291. "Τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁδὸν μεσάσαντες τὴν ἄγουσαν ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρόν σου τὸν τίμιον…"

chon idiomelon of lauds), "Having completed half the sea of abstinence, we await the harbor of salvation, the time of your voluntary Passion…"[1292] (second apostichon of lauds). And finally, one of the most characteristic, the first troparion of the eighth ode of the second triōdion: "In the middle of the day, being crucified by your will in the middle of the earth, O Compassionate one, you removed by force the ends of the earth within the throat of the dragon; for which reason in the middle week of the divine Fast while venerating we glorify your precious Cross…."[1293] Indeed, the Wednesday of the Fourth Week is highlighted as the true midpoint of the holy Fast, while the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross maintained the central gravity of the subject by transference and, in some manner, for pastoral reasons, since the participation of the people during weekday synaxes cannot be universal. Moreover, this Sunday is indeed in the middle of the six weeks of Great Lent, since Great Week is also calculated together with the other weeks, but not at the midpoint of the Fast. During the Wednesday, according to the taxis, there exists a veneration of the Cross, which is why, "Your Cross we worship, O Master, and your holy Resurrection we glorify…,"[1294] is provided for (as well as during Friday) as a troparion of a prophecy during the Trithektē, which is also similarly chanted during the First Hour instead of "Direct my steps…,"[1295] and accordingly, "the veneration of the Cross is done while the idiomela, 'Come faithful…,'[1296] and so forth, are chanted," as the more precise Typika note. During

1292. "Μεσάσαντες τὸ πέλαγος τῆς ἐγκρατείας, λιμένα ἐκδεχόμεθα τῆς σωτηρίας, τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ πάθους σου…"

1293. "Μέσης ἡμέρας σταυρουμένου σου, μέσον τῆς γῆς βουλήσει Κόσμου τὰ πέρατα, μέσον φάρυγγος τοῦ δράκοντος, ἐξέσπασας Οἰκτίρμον· διὸ ἐν μέσῃ, θείων ἑβδομάδι Νηστειῶν, προσκυνοῦντες δοξάζομεν τὸν τίμιον Σταυρόν σου…" Hades is symbolized by the dragon, into which the Cross has been thrust and death conquered. This symbolism is often depicted on the templon above the beautiful gate, see for example the reference in Νίκης Τσιρώνης, "Τὰ λυπηρὰ τοῦ τέμπλου. Ἔμφαση στὴν ἐπιτέλεση," in *TEMPLON. Holy figures, invisible gates of faith. 20th and 21st century*, ed. Χρήστος Φ. Μαργαρίτης (Ἀθῆναι: Ἵδρυμα Αἰκατερίνης Λασκαρίδη, 2017), 98.

1294. "Τὸν Σταυρόν σου προσκυνοῦμεν, Δέσποτα, καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζομεν…"

1295. "Τὰ διαβήματά μου…"

1296. "Δεῦτε πιστοί…"

this day and Tuesday, the Typikon of Saint Sophia, which we referenced, provided for the veneration of the cross by the men, while on Monday and Friday by the women.[1297]

In addition, the Wednesday of the Fourth Week in the services of Vespers and of Matins has elements that are encountered alone in it, precisely for its importance to be highlighted in this manner in relation to the other weekdays of Lent, even compared with the Friday of the same week, with which it shares quite a few common elements. Thus, apart from the two triōdia, it also has a full eight-ode canon and two exaposteilaria in Matins, and two stichēra idiomela and a doxastikon in Vespers. While the Friday has a full canon, it does not have exaposteilaria and idiomela.

For us to conclude, summarizing the many points that we were taught in connection with the apparently simple question: Both Wednesdays of the Third and Fourth Weeks of the Fast certainly are both days of fasting just as all the weekdays of Great Lent. However, the Wednesday of the middle week (of the Fourth) is superior liturgically and more venerable, as the treatment above showed.

581

When was the so-called "Dance of Isaiah" introduced into the service of marriage, how did it come about and what is its purpose?

In a recent answer to question 577, which referred to whether or not during the sacred dance of marriage the priest must hold the Gospel book, the opportunity was given us to make a few retrospections into the history and meaning of this practice. As in the case of many elements of divine worship, so also in the case of sacred dance, we are not able to specify when and by whom it was introduced into the benediction of marriage. And this is very natural because the Church and its worship comprise two enormous dimensions, which span two thousand years and stretch almost on a global geographical scale. Very rarely do there exist clear witnesses regarding the place and the time for the introduction of certain hymns or other litur-

1297. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2:38–39.

gical forms, such as for example, for the Cherubic hymn and "Let our mouths be filled with your praise, O Lord..."[1298] of the Divine Liturgy or, for the feasts, such as the commemoration of the Three Hierarchs or the feast of Orthodoxy. For all the rest, the dating is indirect and by approximation, based on the evidence of the manuscripts and any external testimonies from the words or writings of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers or from various types of information, if any or if revealed to us in the meantime from a search of the sources. Most things in divine worship remain undated with the evidence that this or that practice is encountered in such and such a source or manuscript of a such and such an era or is attested to by a or b author. When, by whom, and where it was introduced, and when it became widespread, in most cases, are unanswerable. In the historical development of the liturgical forms, antiquity is something that is usually desired, but this does not mean that everything old is necessarily the best, nor that everything relatively modern is the worst. Besides, there are old things that have fallen into disuse or even disappeared and modern things that have thrived.

Something analogous also applies regarding the sacred dance of marriage. It is undoubtedly a most ancient element since if we say that wedding events everywhere and always have been associated with dances, sacred or not, there is no danger of us being wrong. Consequently, the question must be whether it can ever be determined when ecclesiastical practice incorporated this dance movement in its worship, in a form indeed decent, solemn, and restrained. In any case, the sacred dance is encountered in manuscripts from the thirteenth century onwards with different variations chiefly regarding the troparia chanted during it. The most characteristic of them, the heirmos of the ninth ode in plagal of the first tone, "Isaiah dance...," was selected as a joyous troparion, not only for the exceptionally rhythmic manner of its chanting and its content (a theotokion that refers to the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah regarding Christ's

1298. "Πληρωθήτω τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν αἰνέσεως, Κύριε..."

birth from a virgin),[1299] but certainly also for the word "dance"[1300] that exists in it. Undoubtedly, this heirmos has not been written for the benediction of marriage, nor does it directly refer to it. However, that its selection was successful is seen from the fact it was considered by popular piety as the main component of marriage, or even one of its most impressive elements, which provided the popular name to the entire benediction. Namely, all the pre-existing universal symbols of Christian worship, very human and expressive elements of the wedding ceremony, such as the rings, crowns, the woman's veil, the joining of the hands of the newlyweds, the blessing of the bridal chamber, the wedding songs and the prayers of the parents and friends present, the drinking of wine and dancing, were gradually adopted by Christian worship and took on an additional and new meaning. And the Christianization of ancient wedding customs was well done in this manner.

Now, specifically regarding the dance of Isaiah, its meaning, the troparia that are chanted during it and especially "Isaiah dance...," what spiritual meaning can all these things have beyond the lively expression of joy and gladness regarding the joyous event of the conclusion of a marriage?[1301] We find the best answer in the beautiful book of the protopresbyter Kōnstantinos Kallinikos, *The Christian temple and what is celebrated within it*, chapter 70: "Not only does it make known in the most vivid manner the spiritual and heavenly desire for the mystical commingling of souls being celebrated and the Christian marriage's purpose, which always comes in order to continue the liberating mystery of Emmanuel upon the earth by the creation of new brethren of Christ, and not only does it teach that there also exists always within this marriage, virginity and chastity, taken in a Christian manner, albeit under another meaning (the Christian

1299. The Greek text from Phountoulēs reads, "γιὰ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννηση τοῦ Χριστοῦ."

1300. "χόρευε."

1301. "σύναψις," is used here in the sense of "bring about" a marriage union, namely, and in this manner, a conclusion of a marriage.

bridal chamber has a delineated purpose), but it also applies the legal seal upon the cohabitation unchangeably and inalienably."[1302]

582

When the priest puts on the epitrachēlion, he says the verse, "Blessed is God who pours forth his grace upon his priests...."[1303] Does he say this always when vesting with the epitrachēlion or only when he is about to celebrate the Divine Liturgy?

583

When the deacon puts on the sticharion, he says whatever also the priest says. What does he say when he puts on the epimanika and the orarion?

Our liturgical tradition is clear and categorical as to when the priest says the verses or more generally those phrases that accompany the putting on of sacred vestments. The *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Philotheos Kokkinos the patriarch of Constantinople, the various standard rubrics that precede the text of the Liturgies, and all the relevant witnesses concur that the putting on of any priestly vestment is accompanied by the traditional expressions after the service of the "kairos," prior to the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy. In these, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki very rightly also seeks the spiritual meaning that the Church gives to each one of the sacred vestments and, relying on these phrases, chooses those most tested and most consistent with "the goal of the Church,"[1304] from the many symbolical explanations and pious theories, which every so often had been formulated (*Dialogue*, chapters 79–83, *Explanation*, 33–44).[1305] These verses, in some manner, comment on the importance of each vestment in relation to the mystery of the Divine Eucharist, which is about to be celebrated. After fully vesting, the priest proceeds to the prothesis for the washing of the hands and the celebration of

1302. Κωνσταντῖνος Καλλινικός, *Ὁ Χριστιανικὸς ναὸς καὶ τὰ τελούμενα ἐν αὐτῷ* (Ἀλεξανδρείας: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1921), 654–655.

1303. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐκχέων τὴν χάριν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ..."

1304. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 150–151.

1305. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 170–183, 100–109.

the service of the proskomidē. For the celebration of other mysteries or sacred services besides the Divine Liturgy, the priest puts on the epitrachēlion and the phelonion, according to the occasion, blesses and kisses the vestments, but does not say the verses that accompany their vesting for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. If some say them out of exaggerated piety or habit, it is certainly not a mortal sin, but it is not orderly. Exaggerations out of piety do not contribute to the proper conducting of the sacred services, just as neither does the pious verbose and unconscious repetitions of relevant or irrelevant (otherwise) sacred words and phrases.

A blessing crosswise and kissing of the sacred vestment precede the vesting. Saint Symeōn provides the meaning of this practice: "He both blesses...and kisses each of the sacred vestments and puts it on in this way, showing that they have been sanctified and are sanctified by the cross of Christ, and having been put on they are in turn imparters of sanctification" (*Dialogue*, chapter 83).[1306] The vestments of the deacon are blessed by the priest ("the sticharion with the orarion")[1307] and the deacon only kisses them, before he puts them on. For the sticharion, it is attested that he says whatever the priest says as well. The same thing also for the epimanika.[1308] A special verse is not handed down for the orarion. The deacon kisses and wears it. Some say, "Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth...,"[1309] which is the traditional inscription of the orarion, on which its symbolism is based: "This indicates wings, as it were, because of the immaterial and spiritual character of the angelic order" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation* 35)[1310] or "which [the orarion] indeed represents the spiritual character of the angels and symbolizes wings when hung on the shoulders; and has the trisagion song of the angels inscribed... It is called an ōrarion (ὡράριον) because it adorns (ὡραΐζειν) him with grace and clothes him with the splendor of God's glory. For it is as

1306. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*,180–183.

1307. "τὸ στιχάριον σὺν τῷ ὁραρίῳ."

1308. ἐπιμάνικα, τά (also known as "epimanikia," ἐπιμανίκια, τά).

1309. "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ..."

1310. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 100–101.

if he [the deacon] is adorned with wings and is clothed with piety and virtue" (*Dialogue*, chapters 123–124).[1311] Despite these beautiful symbolisms, by which the second is reliant on the false etymology of the word "ὀράριον" ("ὠράριον" or rather "ὡράριον"), the parallelisms to the wings of the angels, of the ministering spirits,[1312] and the reference to the trisagion hymn, nothing was said during its vesting. Nor even that which some propose, "whoever would be [or become] first [or great] among you shall be your servant (διάκονος)"[1313] (Matthew 20:26, 23:11, or Mark 10:43, 9:35). The association is completely superficial. The Lord is referring to service (διακονία) of another form and the deacon that puts on the orarion does not claim either a first place or greatness. Our tradition is fine. Contrivances of such a type sometimes sink into simplemindedness, if not also bad taste. For example, the epistle text, "Let us go forth…outside the camp bearing abuse for him"[1314] (Hebrews 13:13) has been heard associated with the wearing of the kalimavkion![1315]

Speaking of the reason for wearing sacred vestments, let some very descriptive details be noted that reveal the piety of our Fathers.

1) From the standard rubrics of certain manuscripts, it appears that after the vesting of the priest and the deacon with their sticharia and epimanikia, while they said the relevant verses, the deacon waited for the complete vesting of the priest while saying "Let us pray to the Lord,"[1316] and perhaps the designated verses, for each one of the vestments. Namely, something analogous to the taxis that is observed during the vesting of the hierarch in the middle of the temple on feast day Liturgies.

1311. PG 155:381c, 381d. The chapters are mistakenly given as 102–103.

1312. Hebrews 1:14.

1313. The correct Scriptural text is: "ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι [ἢ γενέσθαι] πρῶτος [ἢ μέγας] ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος." The misprint in the answer's text involves the reveral of "ὑμῖν" and "ὑμῶν."

1314. "Ἐξερχόμεθα… ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες."

1315. "καλυμμαύχιον." The common modern English usage has been chosen, rather than strict transliteration. This is the common headdress of the Greek clergy.

1316. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

2) When the phelonion has the icon of Christ in the center, "[the priest] does not bless it, but only kisses it. But if it does not have this, he blesses and kisses it."

3) In an euchologion of the thirteenth century (*Sinai 966*), the prayer below is encountered "for the priest to put on the priestly vestment,"[1317] which excellently expresses the meaning of putting on the sacred vestments and their relation to the celebration of the mystery of the Divine Eucharist: "Lord Master...look upon me the sinner and your unworthy servant at this hour and who is putting on sacred vestments; send down power from on high and strengthen me by the grace of the Holy Spirit, who has been clothed in the grace of the priesthood to stand at this sacred table and to celebrate the mystery of your undefiled Body and precious Blood. For to you belong...."[1318] In all other circumstances of putting on the sacred vestments besides the Divine Liturgy, the priest blesses crosswise and kisses the vestments alone, without saying the relevant verses. Similarly, also, the deacon, after he first receives a blessing from the priest, kisses and puts on his sticharion without saying "My soul shall rejoice...."[1319] He kisses and puts on his orarion, just as during the Divine Liturgy, likewise without saying anything.

584

Why are some canons chanted with the verse, "Glory to your holy Resurrection, O Lord,"[1320] "O Saint of God, intercede for us,"[1321] and so forth, and others are chanted, "without a verse"[1322]?

1317. "εἰς τὸ ἀμφιέννυσθαι τὸν ἱερέα τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολήν."

1318. "Δέσποτα Κύριε... ἔπιδε ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν καὶ ἀνάξιον δοῦλον σου ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ στολὴν περιβαλλόμενον ἱερᾶν· δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους κατάπεμψον καὶ ἐνίσχυσόν με τῇ χάριτι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἐνδεδυμένον τὴν τῆς ἱερωσύνης χάριν παραστῆναι τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ τραπέζῃ καὶ ἱερουργῆσαι τὸ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα. Ὅτι πρέπει σοι..." The text is similar to the prayer of the Cherubic hymn. This may possibly reflect the transfer of the proskomidē, and obviously vesting, to a place prior to the Divine Liturgy, and which may in turn have necessitated the duplication of a prayer of preparation for celebration (such as that of the prayer of the Cherubic hymn).

1319. "Ἀγαλλιάσεται ἡ ψυχή μου..."

1320. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἀναστάσει σου, Κύριε."

1321. "Ἅγιε τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν."

1322. "ἄνευ στίχου."

We wrote concerning this topic in great detail and I think with much clarity when answering question 491, which referred precisely to this matter. This is about a mistaken interpretation of an old rubric, which perpetuates an obvious error and originates not only from ignorance of the old, but also the contemporary monastic liturgical practice. In a few words, the topic is as follows.

The troparia of the canon are never chanted, as if, "in stray manner," but are always dependent on a propsalma, whether it is a verse from the nine odes of the Psalter or a brief phrase, a doxological exclamation or invocation, like these two that are mentioned in the question and like many others that are in use even nowadays during the chanting of the canons such as, "Most holy Theotokos, save us,"[1323] "O Cross of Christ, save us by your power,"[1324] "O Baptist of Christ, intercede for us,"[1325] "Glory to you, our God, glory to you,"[1326] and similar ones. When the ancient Typika prescribe that the canon is chanted "without a verse," they mean that on these days the stichologia of the odes "is absent,"[1327] namely, that the canons are chanted without the verse, which, as we know, is taken from the corresponding odes of the Psalter and is chanted before[1328] the troparia. Originally, these instances were rare, namely, they were confined only to Pascha and to Renewal Week, during which the stichologia of the Psalter and of the nine odes is generally absent. The chanting without a verse was later extended to both the great feasts of the Lord and these feasts of the Theotokos and of great saints, with a tendency of becoming the norm. In many monasteries due to a shortage of men, or even from an influence of the parish practice, the canons were chanted or read without a verse (of the odes), but with the propsalmata,[1329] such as those that we mentioned, according to the subject of the feast being celebrated or even according to the subject of the canon. In essence, the stichologia of the odes

1323. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς."
1324. "Σταυρὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, σῶσον ἡμᾶς τῇ δυνάμει σου."
1325. "Βαπτιστὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν."
1326. "Δόξα σοι, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι."
1327. "σχολάζει."
1328. "προψάλλεται."
1329. Plural of propsalma.

— which are the biblical and essential elements of the service — ceased, and the troparia of the odes of the canons remained, which had been composed for the adornment and not for the replacement of the odes of the Psalter. Namely, like we have a chanting of the stichēra of Vespers without the psalms of the Lamp-lighting ("Lord, I have cried out to you..."[1330] and so forth) and a chanting of the stichēra of lauds without Psalms 148, 149, and 150 of the Psalter. But in any case, in some monasteries, in spite of the unfavorable factors that we mentioned above, the canonical taxis of the stichologia was preserved, namely, the chanting of the nine odes with the intercalation of troparia of the canons at their twelfth, tenth, eighth, or sixth verses provided for by the taxis, that is to say, the chanting of the troparia of the odes of the canons "with a verse" or "without a verse" or with the pertinent propsalmata, when the Typikon did not provide for a stichologia for the odes of the Psalter. This correct taxis tends nowadays to be restored in recently reorganized great men's and women's monasteries, but not in all.

Conversely, apparently, the odes were never chanted with stichologia in the parishes, apart from the first part of the ninth ode, the ode for the Theotokos, which is chanted by verse with the ephymnion/troparion, "More honorable than the Cherubim...."[1331] The canons are always chanted "without a verse" with the well-known propsalmata, "Glory to your holy Resurrection, O Lord,"[1332] "Glory to you, our God, glory to you,"[1333] "O Saint of God, intercede for us,"[1334] and so forth.

It is self-evident but let us write it, that all the above only relate to the service of Matins. The canons outside of Matins, such as in the Paraklēseis for the Panagia, in Complines, in the Sunday Midnight Office, in unction, in the funeral service, in the memorial services, and wherever else canons are chanted, are everywhere chanted, both in the monasteries and in the parishes, without a

1330. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ..."
1331. "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν τῶν Χερουβίμ..."
1332. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἀναστάσει σου, Κύριε."
1333. "Δόξα σοι, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι."
1334. "Ἅγιε τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν."

verse from the biblical odes, "without a verse," namely also here, but always with the pertinent propsalma ("Most holy Theotokos, save us," "Glory to you, our God, glory to you," "Have mercy upon me, O God, have mercy upon me,"[1335] and so forth). The reason is obvious: the stichologia of the odes of the Psalter is an element of the service of Matins alone and not of other services, even if their structure has been created in imitation of Matins, such as the Paraklēseis, the memorial services, and unction. It is very possible that the instances above influenced and contributed to the stichologia of the odes being omitted in Matins and, at least in parish temples, the simpler practice being preferred, the canons being chanted without the verses of biblical odes, but with their simpler propsalmata.

Let us note that the confusion between a verse of the odes and a propsalma, namely, the misinterpretation of the rubric, "without a verse," is quite old. Thus, the Typikon in force states that "not one verse is chanted before the troparia of all the feasts of the Lord (except that of Pascha, when 'Glory to your holy Resurrection, O Lord' is said), but only 'Glory, both now' for the last two ones,"[1336] which confuses a "verse" (of the biblical odes) and a propsalma.

Let us summarize: The old rubric, "without a verse," means that the canons are chanted without the stichologia of the nine odes in the exceptional instances of a festal Matins. Then—and always in parishes—as well as during the canons outside of Matins, the corresponding propsalma is chanted before each troparion. But troparia of the odes of the canons are never chanted without a verse of the ode or without a propsalma.

Specifically, during those instances where the Typikon in use records the misunderstood rubric that the canons are chanted "without a verse" (feasts of the Lord, Great Week, and so forth), a verse from the corresponding ode of the Psalter is not chanted before the troparia of the canons, given that the nine odes are not chanted with stichologia, but "Glory to you, our God, glory to you" and, on the feast of the Precious Cross, "O Cross of Christ, save us by

1335. "Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεός, ἐλεησόν με."

1336. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 22.

your power."[1337] Certainly, the Typikon of Kōnstantinos expressly prescribes regarding the canons "without a verse" of Mid-Pentecost and of the Ascension that "Glory to you, our God, glory to you" is chanted as a propsalma.[1338] In the canons of the feasts of the Mother of God (the Meeting of Christ and the Annunciation), "Most holy Theotokos, save us" is chanted as a propsalma, just as in the canon of the Akathist and in the canons of Paraklēseis. In the trinitarian canons of the Sunday Midnight Office, "Holy Trinity, God, have mercy and save us,"[1339] is chanted as a propsalma.

In the periodical of Sacred Metropolis of Thessaloniki, *Grēgorios ho Palamas*, issue 782, March–April 2000, pp. 263–290, a comprehensive article by the great protopresbyter Father Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs has been published with the title, "The canons and the taxis for their chanting," where matters concerning the canons and the manner of their stichologia and chanting are set forth.[1340]

585

During the chanting (or the reading) of the canons, when is the heirmos chanted and when is it omitted?

586

In the Mēnaia, why are the heirmoi cited in some canons, but not in others and only partially in others?

587

In the services of the two canons of the Paraklēseis[1341] in the Hōrologion, the heirmoi are cited in each ode. Must they be chanted or not?

1337. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 74.

1338. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 248, 252.

1339. "Ἁγία Τριάς, ὁ Θεός, ἐλέησον καὶ σῶσον ἡμᾶς."

1340. Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαγιάννης, "Οἱ κανόνες καὶ ἡ τάξις ψαλμῳδίας αὐτῶν," *Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς* 83 (2000): 263–290. Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs (1929–2014).

1341. In other words, the Small Paraklēsis and Great Paraklēsis.

The relevant rubrics of the Typikon appear at first glance complex and more or less arbitrary or at least unjustifiable. They are none of these things, but very simple and perfectly justified, if we understand the "mechanism" by which this system of ecclesiastical poetry and chanting works and have the prerequisite interest and the relevant experience. We will try to be brief and clear.

The heirmoi in the church service have a double function. First, from the viewpoint of form, they constitute the troparion–pattern, a kind of "automelon," for the troparia of each single ode of the canon, which can be called "prosomoia" of the heirmos. The terms "automelon" and "prosomoion" are not used in the composition and chanting of the canons, but of the troparia. However, their function is identical. Based on the heirmoi, the individual troparia of each single ode "are strung together,"[1342] composed of an equal number of verses, syllables, and placement of accents. At the start of each ode, the beginning of the heirmos is always cited in order not only to indicate the pattern for composition of the troparia of the ode, but also for practical reasons, in order for the manner of their chanting to be indicated. The same thing is also precisely done in prosomoia troparia, in which the indication of the tone and their automelon always precede. Under no circumstances is the automelon chanted prior to the stichēron prosomoion. It is self-evident that the manner of its chanting is presumably known to the one chanting. An exception exists in rare cases, where the automelon is the first troparion in the series of stichēra, such as for example, "As noble among martyrs..."[1343] of Saint Geōrgios, "With what wreaths of praise..."[1344] of the Chief Apostles, and so forth. The same thing also occurs with the heirmoi, when in rare instances the heirmos is identical with the first troparion of the odes, such as for example during Nativity ("Christ is born..."),[1345] Pascha ("It is the day of the Resurrection..."),[1346] and so forth. Then the hiermos—first troparion—is quoted in its

1342. "εἴρονται," is defined as "co-ordinated, paratactic, with the elements in a continuous and potentially unending series," (Cambridge, s.v. "εἴρω[1]").

1343. "Ὡς γενναῖον ἐν μάρτυσιν..."

1344. "Ποίοις εὐφημιῶν στέμμασιν..."

1345. "Χριστὸς γεννᾶται..."

1346. "Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα..."

entirety because it is also chanted as the first troparion of each ode of the canon.

Second, from the viewpoint of content, the heirmos is also itself a troparion that depends on the biblical ode to which it belongs—it is inspired by it and constitutes its summary and poetical elaboration. As such, the heirmos is inserted in the service of Matins as its troparion and functions as a connecting link between biblical and ecclesiastical poetry. Certainly, in many instances, this function is preeminently organic because it combines the biblical subject of the ode with the subject of the feast, as chiefly takes place on feasts of the Lord, feasts of the Precious Cross, and in part also on feasts of the Mother of God. Thus, it is intercalated into the stichologia of the odes of the Psalter at the beginning of the first canon of the day, and certainly, is also repeated twice without a verse of the ode in order that the relevant emphasis is given. The troparia of the first canon follow, to which the heirmos belongs, as well as the troparia of the remaining canons of the day, which are provided for by the rubrics of the Typikon. The heirmos of the second or even of the third canon is not chanted but is only noted at the beginning of the troparia for the manner of their chanting to be indicated, as we already said. The other heirmoi are again not chanted for the reason that we mentioned above: that the connection of an ode of the Psalter and a canon was done with the first heirmos. By exception, the heirmoi of the second canon of Nativity, Theophany, and Pentecost (the iambics), as well as the Dormition of the Theotokos, are chanted.

Generally, in printed liturgical books, the full text of the heirmoi of the first canon are alone quoted. However, if for whatever reason the full text of the others is also printed, then during the chanting (or the reading) the intermediate heirmoi are omitted.

This taxis is only observed in the service of Matins since only during it are the odes of the Psalter chanted with stichologia. Outside of Matins, the heirmoi are not chanted precisely because the odes are not chanted with stichologia. This is how it is done in the Paraklēseis of the Theotokos, or, according to the modern custom, also of various saints, and during Complines, unction, funereal

services (funerals and memorial services, according to the ancient taxis), and so forth. By exception, the heirmoi of the Great Canon and of the Akathist are chanted, when they are chanted in parts or whole during Great Lent. The reason is obvious: the Great Canon and the canon of the service of the Akathist are normally chanted as canons of Matins on Thursday and Saturday of the Fifth Week of the Fast respectively. Their transference to Compline during the Wednesday or Friday of the same Week and their chanting in parts during the Complines of the First Week and during the Complines of the Fridays of Lent had as a result also the preservation of the heirmoi of the odes of their canons.

Conversely, let it be noted that in accordance with the above, the canons of the Paraklēseis for the Theotokos are chanted without the heirmoi when they are chanted as Paraklēseis, but with the heirmoi when, during the feasts of notable saints, one of them is chanted as the first canon in the service of Matins. For this secondary use, they are published in our liturgical books with the full text of the heirmoi at each ode.

Finally, when katabasies are not chanted during weekdays, after the end of the chanting (or reading) of the third, sixth, eighth, and ninth odes, the heirmos of the respective odes is chanted, however, not of the first, but of the last canon, as it is provided for by the Typikon.[1347] For this reason, in various printed editions of the liturgical books, the full text of the heirmoi of the last canon are cited at the end of the odes above.

For further information, we also again refer to the study of Father Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs, "The canons and the taxis for their

1347. Phountoulēs is emphasizing that on those weekdays where instead of katabasies the Typikon prescribes the heirmos to be chanted at the conclusion of an ode, in the event there are multiple canons (primary, secondary, and so forth) provided for each ode in the service books, only the heirmos of the last canon would be chanted in place of a katabasia to conclude that corresponding ode in these instances. This is why the full text of those hermoi is printed at the end of those odes, as a quick, practical reference guide for this specific situation.

chanting," in the periodical, *Grēgorios ho Palamas*, issue 782 (2000), pp. 263–290.[1348]

588

How must the petition "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἡμῶν ἔθνους…" (For our pious nation…) be said in the litany of peace? It is encountered with various forms in the liturgical books, and some also add other petitions in practice. Which is the most correct form?[1349]

Indeed, from the standpoint of form, this much-afflicted petition has been suffering for many years, rather for quite a few centuries. Of course, this is to be expected since our prayers and the liturgical petitions that mention kings[1350] and all those who are "in high position"[1351] "are customary to be changed at the same time"[1352] with political matters, according to the beautiful expression of the sacred Phōtios, or according to canon thirty-eight of the Penthektē Council in Trullo, "let the organization of ecclesiastical affairs follow civil and state patterns"[1353] (compare also canon seventeen of the Fourth Ecumenical Council).[1354] Of course, the sacred Phōtios's words and the canons of the councils that we mentioned clearly concern an-

1348. Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαγιάννης, "Οἱ κανόνες καὶ ἡ τάξις ψαλμῳδίας αὐτῶν," *Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς* 83 (2000): 263–290. Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs (1929–2014).

1349. For related discussions, see questions 189 (end of the answer), 211–212 (end of the answer), 225, 256, 396 (where there is a brief discussion of imperial polychronismoi), and 417.

1350. Please note that the same word, "βασιλεύς," can be translated as "king" or "emperor" according to context.

1351. "ἐν ὑπεροχῇ," 1 Timothy 2:2.

1352. The citation is taken from the text: "Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά, καὶ μάλιστά γε τὰ περὶ τῶν ἐνοριῶν δίκαια, ταῖς πολιτικαῖς ἐπικρατείαις τε καὶ διοικήσεσι συμμεταβάλλεσθαι εἴωθεν" (Since it is customary for ecclesiastical rights and especially those concerning parishes [dioceses] to be changed at the same time with civil provinces and dioceses), Saint Phōtios the Great, *Epistle 290* in *Photius, Epistolae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L.G. Westerink (Leipzig: Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985), 3:136. The numbering of the epistle follows the latter edition. The translation was modified in the answer to fit the grammatical structure of the sentence.

1353. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:392.

1354. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:258–259.

other topic, but a parallel topic. Because, although inasmuch as our liturgical texts, due to their sanctity and long-term use, have some inherent difficulty in adaptation, and despite what is said loudly about their immutability, it is a fact that at many points they are automatically adapted, usually before formal guidance was issued by the ecclesiastical authority. And since the question refers to a specific petition of our services as well as to influence and modification according to the political circumstances, it is good for us to refer to the experience of the old-timers on this question,[1355] who knew and recall similar influences of political realities not only upon the disputed "much-afflicted" (as we characterized it) petition of the litany of peace, but also on other points of divine worship. Thus, they will recall the chanting or the omission of the polychronismos of the king and its modification with the addition or removal of various persons in it, and especially "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς" (O Lord, save your kings), of the original text of the Divine Liturgy with, "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς" (O Lord, save the pious), the coexistence of both, and finally the prevalence only of the second one, according to the circumstances at the time. Or even, in order to more closely approach the question, the removal or the omission of a petition for the kings at the beginning of Matins and in the litany of peace, or the self-explanatory change of the names of the kings and similar things.[1356]

The form of this petition of the litany of peace, as it is encountered in the manuscripts and printed editions, is the following: "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ Θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν" (For our most pious and God-protected emperors, all of their palace and army, let us pray to the Lord). It seems that the names of the emperors at the time, one or two, and even of the empress, were also added to it, as it appears from the evidence of the term, "δείνων" (names),[1357] that

1355. Namely, the priests who were active during the times in which Greece was a kingdom, but also at other times, a republic.

1356. Phountoulēs is referring to political changes in Greece during the twentieth century including successions of royal heads and abolitions of the monarchy.

1357. "Δείνων" is translated here as "names," although literally it can be translated as "such and such," "so and so," and other similar phrases. This term is

exists after "βασιλέως ἡμῶν" (our emperor) in quite a few manuscripts. "Τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου" (of the palace and army) were terms commonly used in the Byzantine period during which our texts were developed. "Παλάτιον" (palace) is the entirety of the civil authorities ("παντός," of all) and "στρατόπεδον" (army) is the "φιλόχριστος στρατός" (Christ-loving armed forces), as it is specified in other instances. In the Divine Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, the petition is more complex, "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοστέπτων ὀρθοδόξων ἡμῶν βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς οὐρανόθεν βοηθείας, σκέπης καὶ νίκης αὐτῶν τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν" (For our most pious and God-crowned Orthodox emperors, all of their palace and army, and of their assistance, protection, and victory from heaven, let us pray to the Lord).[1358] In the Alexandrian Liturgy of the apostle Markos, it is simpler: "Προσεύξασθε ὑπὲρ τῶν φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων" (Let us pray for our Christ-loving emperors).[1359]

The difficulty began in Turkish-occupied and Frankish-occupied areas after the destruction of the empire.[1360] While initially the manuscripts preserved the traditional form of the petition, changes were done during the celebration of services and recitation of the litany of peace. It is not precluded that some said the petition just as is. There also exist manuscripts in which it was finally omitted or replaced with the vague and awkward, "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων Χριστιανῶν" (For pious and Orthodox Christians), just as also was done with "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς" (Lord, save the pious) ("... βασιλεῖς," emperors), and with, "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου...νίκας

commonly used in petitions and prayers to indicate the insertion of names.

1358. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 72.

1359. Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 35; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 91–92, 98–99.

1360. The fall of the Byzantine Empire was gradual but culminated with the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453. During its fall, former imperial areas were occupied by Turkish and various Western European ("Frankish") forces.

τοῖς εὐσεβέσι κατ' ἐναντίων..." (O Lord, save your people...grant victory to the pious over the adversaries),[1361] during modern times.

After the liberation of the Greek state, the petition for the emperors returned and the names of kings were added according to period and circumstance.[1362] However, since this petition had already been replaced with the general petition, "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων Χριστιανῶν" (For pious and Orthodox Christians), a perhaps explicable complication occurred. The petition remained as above and was preserved or even completely fell into disuse, but the old petition for the emperors returned, but not where its original place was (prior to the entreaty for the archbishop), but after it. The phrase of the petition was modified for unknown reasons. Possibly, the old terms "Θεοφυλάκτων" (God-protected), "παλατίου" (palace), and "στρατοπέδου" (army) were not understandable and were not cared for. Thus, with many variations, spoken or even attested to by printed editions, the petition became "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν" (For our most pious kings) often with an insertion of the royal family's many names (they reached up to six), frequently repeating the epithet "εὐσεβέστατος" (most pious) for each one, and with the detailed citation of the individual armed services, ("τοῦ κατὰ ξηράν, θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀέρα φιλοχρίστου ἡμῶν στρατοῦ," of our Christ-loving armed forces by dry land, sea, and air). This form of the petition, verbose, ostentatious and pretentious, was reciprocally influenced by the corresponding petition of the ektenēs, "Εὐξώμεθα..." (Let us pray...), and especially that of the commemoration during the great entrance. Thus, the security forces were added by some ("καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἀσφαλείας τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν," and the security forces of our Fatherland) with the obvious risk of continuing the slippery slope towards the addition of other parallel military or police forces. However, this was probably avoided in the end because it began to exceed the limits of seriousness, and the petition, I think everywhere, returned to a simpler form, but also to one verbose and inconsistent with the traditional petition, "ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ ξηράν

1361. See question 417 regarding this troparion.

1362. Here again, the same word, "βασιλεύς," can be translated as "king" or "emperor" according to context.

[ἢ "γῆν"], θάλασσαν καὶ ἀέρα [ἢ "ἀέρα καὶ θάλασσαν"] φιλοχρίστου ἡμῶν στρατοῦ" (for our Christ-loving armed forces by dry land [or "land"], sea, and air [or "air and sea"]). This last part of the phrase is simple, serious, and in accordance with the tradition and decency of divine worship. The phrase "καὶ τοῦ φιλοχρίστου ἡμῶν στρατοῦ" (and our Christ-loving armed forces) is sufficient and complete. The expression "ξηράν, θάλασσαν καὶ ἀέρα" (dry land, sea, and air) is superfluous and slackens the austere form for the formulation of our entreaties to God.

With political change, it was to be expected that the petition for the kings would be eliminated.[1363] But instead of the petition remaining for its original and correct purpose, namely, as a petition for authorities of any nature and name, it became a petition "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους" (for the nation) and especially "τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἡμῶν ἔθνους" (our pious nation), namely, for the people. However, the petition for the people has its place in the preceding petition "ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν...παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ" (for our Archbishop...all the clergy and the people). The simpler and more correct form of this first part of the entreaty that is referring to the authorities would be "ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων ἀρχόντων ἡμῶν" (for our most pious authorities) and nothing else. The authorities and the armed forces are always called "εὐσεβέστατοι" (most pious") and "φιλόχριστοι" (Christ-loving), whether in an attestative manner or in an optative manner, or both for reasons of courtesy and of a sacred complement. Namely, the entire petition, consistent with the above, ought to take the following form: "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων ἀρχόντων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ φιλοχρίστου στρατοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν" (For our most pious authorities and the Christ-loving armed forces, let us pray to the Lord).

1363. At the time of this writing, the Greek monarchy was abolished (by a referendum in 1974) and a republic established (by a constitution promulgated in 1975).

589

In Sunday Matins, is "Holy is the Lord our God"[1364] chanted three times and afterwards "Exalt the Lord our God and worship at the footstool of His feet for He is holy"[1365] or only two times and afterwards "Exalt…"?

590

During the Paschal period, is "Holy is the Lord our God" chanted only three times without "Exalt…." because this verse is pertaining to the Crucifixion?

According to the taxis in force nowadays, which follows the tradition of the Jerusalemite Monastery of Saint Sabas, "Holy is the Lord our God" is chanted throughout all the Sundays of the year, during which a resurrectional eōthinon exaposteilarion is chanted from the series of eleven prosomoia of "Let us join the disciples…"[1366] of the Oktōēchos, a composition of the emperor Kōnstantinos VII Porphyrogennētos (913–959). In this sense, "Holy is the Lord our God" could be characterized as a prokeimenon of the exaposteilarion, since the manner of its chanting is similar, although somewhat singular in relation to the classical prokeimena. Thus, it is taken from Psalm 98, of which it constitutes the second half of the final verse (98:9), it is chanted three times, and the fifth verse of the same psalm is joined to it, which is also itself chanted, without the prokeimenon being recited and without also again being repeated, just as it is done for all other prokeimena. The prokeimenon ("Holy is the Lord our God") ought to be usually chanted twice, the verse ("Exalt…") is recited, and the prokeimenon ("Holy…") is repeated for the third time. Perhaps the end of the verse ("…for He is holy")[1367] was in some manner considered a summary of the prokeimenon and made its repetition again unnecessary. Its "singularity" in relation to prokeimena consists in the points above. However, the manner of its chanting was not

1364. "Ἅγιος Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν."

1365. "Ὑψοῦτε Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἅγιός ἐστι"

1366. "Τοῖς μαθηταῖς συνέλθωμεν…"

1367. "ὅτι ἅγιός ἐστι."

always like this. In the *Codex National Library of Greece 848* from the fifteenth century, it is presented to be chanted three times as a verse[1368] with two somewhat modified verses of Psalm 98 ("Ὅτι ἅγιον ὑπάρχει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ," [For his name is holy] and "Καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὸν λαόν σου," [And over all your people], verses 3 and 2[1369]). But in older manuscripts of the prokeimenon (*Patmos 105* and *Athens 680*), the half-verse 2b "And over all peoples"[1370] is chanted during the repetitions. Both variations above in the chanting make "Holy is the Lord our God" approach the prokeimena even more and their manner of chanting as well. Nevertheless, it is not a prokeimenon of the exaposteilarion. It is itself a venerable archaic exaposteilarion.

Indeed, in the manuscripts, "Holy is the Lord…" is called an "ἐξαποστειλάριον" or "ἐξαποστελλάριον" or "[ὁ] ἐξαποστειλάριος [ὕμνος]"[1371] and constitutes an element of the resurrectional service of Sundays, before the resurrectional exaposteilaria of Kōnstantinos were even introduced. Thus, in the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergertis of Constantinople (*Codex Athens 788* of the twelfth century),[1372] "Holy is the Lord…" is chanted as an exaposteilarion in the tone of the week ("in the appointed tone" or "of the tone" or "in the tone") on all Sundays of the year, and by extension also on feasts of the Lord, which did not have an exaposteilarion at the time (such as that of Pentecost in the grave tone, that of the Indiction "of the tone for the day it happened to be") or on feasts that did have an exaposteilarion, but also preserved the ancient one ("Holy is the Lord…"), which preceded the exaposteilarion of the feast just as it is done nowadays with the eōthina, on the Exaltation of the Precious Cross (Exaposteilarion "Holy is the Lord" or that of the Cross, "The Cross,

1368. "Chanted as a verse," is used to translate "στιχολογεῖται."

1369. For comparison, the unmodified verses from the Psalm in question are the following: "ὅτι φοβερὸν καὶ ἅγιόν ἐστιν" (verse 3) and "καὶ ὑψηλός ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαούς" (verse 2).

1370. "Καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαούς σου."

1371. [the] exaposteilarios [hymn].

1372. For a complete listing of all exaposteilaria in this monastery, see the translated Typikon in Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6–6.7 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000–2005).

the guardian..."[1373]), on the Transfiguration ("Holy is the Lord" and that of the feast, "Immutable light..."[1374]), or at the Entrance ("Exaposteilarion of the feast, but if you do not have it, say "Holy is the Lord...."), and so forth. On the feast of the Antipascha (of Thomas), the only resurrectional exaposteilarion in use at that time out of the eleven, "When the doors had been shut, O Master...,"[1375] is encountered without, "Holy is the Lord...." According to the Typikon of the Evergetis, "Holy is the Lord..." in the second tone was chanted as an exposteilarion on Great Saturday,[1376] while according to the Typikon of the Temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem from the year 1122 (*Codex Timiou Stavrou 43*), "Holy is the Lord..." and the special exaposteilarion, "He ceased and rested in a tomb...,"[1377] were chanted on Great Saturday.[1378] According to the same Typikon, on Pascha and throughout Renewal Week, "Holy is the Lord...," and, "In the flesh sleeping...," were chanted.[1379]

From this retrospection into our liturgical tradition and taxis, the importance that our Fathers attributed to this most ancient exaposteilarion, which provided the resurrectional festive tone at this point of the Sunday morning service and by extension also in other great feasts, I think, has become absolutely apparent.

Saint Athanasios of Alexandria stresses the special importance of the psalm, from which "Holy is the Lord" has been taken: "This signifies the kingdom of Christ" (*Commentary on the psalms*, 98)[1380]

1373. "Σταυρὸς ὁ φύλαξ..."

1374. "Φῶς ἀναλλοίωτον..."

1375. "Συγκεκλεισμένων, δέσποτα..."

1376. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 496–497.

1377. "'Ἐν μνήματι κατέπαυσε..." The full text is "'Ἐν μνήματι κατέπαυσε/ ἐν Σαββάτῳ, ὡς πάλαι, ἐξ ἔργων ὧν ἐποίησεν / ὁ Θεάνθρωπος Λόγος, ὃν συναντήσας ὁ Ἅδης / ἐπικράνθη ἐμέσας οὓς ἐξ Ἀδὰμ προπέπωκε, / Θάνατος δὲ νεκροῦται, καὶ γηγενεῖς γηθοσύνως / μέλπομεν σὺν ἀγγέλοις 'ἀνάστηθι, βοήθησον / ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου,'" Compare the use of "καταπαύω" in 2 Chronicles 16:5.

1378. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:173.

1379. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:196, 210, 226, 234, 243, and 251.

1380. PG 27:421a.

and commenting on, "Exalt the Lord our God and worship at the footstool of his feet for he is holy," he notes: "He who is exalted as God and has under his feet every creature, has become man without change. Therefore, he says, exalt Him who became man without change, worshipping Him with one adoration with his own flesh…[1381] And proclaiming the incarnation and economy, again assuring us he[1382] signifies the divinity by the mountain being indicated ['and worship at his holy mountain,' verse 9]. For God has remained, even though He took the form of the servant on account of our salvation."[1383] And the same Athanasios the Great in his letter "to Marcellinus on the interpretation of the psalms," again makes the Christological reference to the passions and to the glory of the Lord: "Reading…the ninety-eighth [psalm] you will be able to behold the benefits that have come to us from the Savior through his passions" (paragraph 26).[1384] A pious person who lives within this patristic tradition waited with longing to hear "Holy is the Lord…" on every Sunday in order to feel the joy and exultation[1385] of the Resurrection and the appearance of Christ's glory. Unfortunately, many times our ignorance or indolence separates us from this hagiographical and patristic commentary and worship tradition. We are afraid of wasting a second by repeating for the third time this resurrectional triumphal hymn.

According to the taxis, as we already said, "Holy is the Lord our God" is chanted three times consistent with the form of the Holy Trinity and "in confirmation,"[1386] but in the third repetition the

1381. PG 27:421c.

1382. The author of the psalm.

1383. PG 27:421c–421d.

1384. PG 27:37c.

1385. "σκίρτημα." The word appears to be used here in its patristic sense, cf. Lampe, s.v. "σκίρτημα, τό."

1386. "εἰς βεβαίωσιν," appears to be an allusion to the phrase "ἐβεβαίου τοῦ λόγου τὸ ἀσφαλές" ("confirmed the certainty of the word") from the apolytikion of Theophany, "Ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτιζομένου σου Κύριε, ἡ τῆς Τριάδος ἐφανερώθη προσκύνησις· τοῦ γὰρ Γεννήτορος ἡ φωνὴ προσεμαρτύρει σοι, ἀγαπητόν σε Υἱὸν ὀνομάζουσα· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς, ἐβεβαίου τοῦ λόγου τὸ ἀσφαλές. Ὁ ἐπιφανεὶς Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὸν κόσμον φωτίσας δόξα

verse is added, "Exalt the Lord our God and worship at the footstool of his feet for he is holy." The resurrectional exaposteilarion follows.

Three times during the year (the Saturday of Lazarus, Palm Sunday, and Great Saturday), "Holy is the Lord our God" is chanted without the verse, "Exalt the Lord our God and worship at the footstool of his feet for he is holy," indeed without an exaposteilarion coming next, on Palm Sunday and Great Saturday, just as we saw also take place in the Typikon of the Resurrection. The only explanation of the matter is that in these exceptional and venerable instances an older tradition and taxis are preserved in contemporary liturgical practice, a liturgical archaism. The ancient Typika that we mentioned, and what others we consulted, do not allow us to know whether on the above days "Holy is the Lord" was chanted with or without the verse, "Exalt the Lord." The old Typika are addressed to persons who know the taxis and for this reason have such a concise form. They are simply a reminder of the familiar. The omission completely of the verse, "Exalt the Lord...," is not attested to, except

---

σοι." In addition, the following discussion is taken from question 465 regarding the notion of confirmation:

> Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, when commenting on the triple repetition of certain phrases and practices, such as the renunciation, the affirmation, the infusion, the recitation of the symbol of faith before baptism, the triple supplication of the candidate for tonsure to the monastic schēma, and the triple exchange of rings during the betrothal, is not limited only to their theological explanation, namely, the reference to the honor and the glory of the Holy Trinity, 'of our only God in Trinity,' or 'of the trihypostatic divinity.' He also uses certain words, which recall legal technical terminology: 'in confirmation' (εἰς βεβαίωσιν), 'for the guarantee' (διὰ τὸ βέβαιον), 'confirming' (βεβαιῶν), 'for security' (διὰ τὸ ἀσφαλές) (*Dialogue*, chapters 62, 269, 278). It is very possible that the triple repetition of certain key words or the triple performance of symbolic practices or the triple repetition of a question/answer actually has its origins in the provisions of Roman law, which sought the confirmation and security of certain transactions and legal acts in this way, which originally indeed were only oral. Christian theology comes afterwards to sanctify and to give spiritual meaning to this ancient custom, relating it to the Holy Trinity, 'which may both accomplish and confirm everything' (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 278).

only for these three instances. During the Sundays of the Pentēkostarion (obviously apart from the Sunday of Pentecost), "Holy is the Lord" is chanted with the verse, "Exalt...," just as all the Sundays of the year. The reason given that the verse, "Exalt...," is omitted, that it is pertaining to the Crucifixion and consequently incongruous with the Paschal period, is not strong. We saw that Athanasios the Great provides one interpretation for the verse when relating it (just as also the entire ninety-eighth psalm) to the incarnation and to the glory of the kingdom of the Lord. Another interpretation also certainly exists that equates the "footstool"[1387] with Christ's Cross. Compare, "Today the prophetic saying has been fulfilled, for behold we worship at the place where your feet stood, O Lord...,"[1388] and especially, "Today the holy clear utterance of David received completion, for behold we openly worship the footstool of your undefiled feet...,"[1389] and "That which of old Moses...and David the melodist when saying your footstool prescribed for your precious Cross to be worshipped...,"[1390] and the eisodikon itself for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, which is precisely the verse in question of the ninety-eighth psalm, "Exalt the Lord our God and worship at the footstool of his feet for he is holy." Anyway, however it may be, Cross and Resurrection go hand in hand, as in all the hymns and in "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...,"[1391] which half refers to the Cross and half to the Resurrection of the Lord. Our "theology" to be genuine must explain the liturgical tradition of the Church. Only then does it teach rightly.

The topic of "Holy is the Lord..." is treated by the oikonomos and hierarchical vicar of Skiathos of blessed memory, Father Geōr-

1387. "ὑποπόδιον."

1388. "Σήμερον τὸ προφητικὸν πεπλήρωται λόγιον· Ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσκυνοῦμεν εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ ἔστησαν οἱ πόδες σου Κύριε...," kathisma of Matins for the Third Sunday of the Fast, the Veneration of the Cross.

1389. "Σήμερον ὡς ἀληθῶς, ἡ ἀγιόφθογγος ῥῆσις τοῦ Δαυῒδ πέρας εἴληφεν· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐμφανῶς, τὸ τῶν ἀχράντων ποδῶν σου προσκυνοῦμεν ὑποπόδιον...," stichēron idiomelon, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross.

1390. "Ὅνπερ πάλαι Μωϋσῆς...καὶ Δαυῒδ ὁ μελῳδός, ὑποπόδιόν σοι βοῶν, προσκυνεῖσθαι διετάξατο, τίμιον Σταυρόν σου, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός...," stichēron prosomoion, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross.

1391. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."

gios Rēgas, in, *Questions of the Typikon*, second edition, "Leitourgika Vlatadōn 2," Thessaloniki 1999, pp. 59–60.[1392] He considers it a prokeimenon, confirms its three time repetition with testimonies from the Typika and musical books, and holds the view that the verse "Exalt..." is incorrectly omitted in the three cases mentioned above (Lazarus, Palm Sunday, and Great Saturday). "Out of conviction, he believes" that the rubric of the new Typikon concerning the chanting twice of "Holy is Lord..." is mistaken and the omission of the verse, "Exalt the Lord our God..." is owed to a misinterpretation of the old rubric "this three times only and nothing else" or "the same also only three times," which concerns the non-chanting of any troparion/exaposteilarion during Palm Sunday and Great Saturday. He is completely right regarding the repetition three times. Regarding the omission of "Exalt the Lord our God...," probably not.

591

When after the communion of the celebrants the deacon "introduces"[1393] the particles into the holy chalice, does he say

1392. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 2, 2nd edition (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1999), 59–60.

1393. "εἰσκομίζει." The word is used to describe this action in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* contained in the *Codex National Library of Athens 8 (under number 662)* from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries and parallels the word "ἐμάξας" (a wiping action for depositing the remaining Holy Elements into the chalice) used to describe this action in the *Diataxis* of Philotheos from the fourteenth century *Codex Panteleēmonos 6277–770*. For both uses, see Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 14 ("ἐμάξας"), 15 ("εἰσκομίζει"). Also compare the use of this word in the fourteenth century *Vatopediou 135*, "λαβὼν μετὰ χεῖρας τόν τε ἅγιον δίσκον καὶ τὴν μοῦσαν, εἰσκομίζει πάντα ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης ἀσφαλείας, ὥστε μηδέν τι τῶν λεπτοτάτων ἐκπεσεῖν ἢ καταλειφθῆναι" (taking with his hand both the holy paten and mousa, he introduces everything into the holy chalice with fear and every care, so that none of finest particles fall or are remaining), *Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας κατὰ τὰ Βατοπαιδινὰ Χειρόγραφα τοῦ ΙΔ' αἰῶνα* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἱερὰ Μεγίστη Μονὴ Βατοπαιδίου, 2019), 1:133.

"Wash away, O Lord..."[1394] or not? Not all the service books[1395] have it.[1396]

The transfer of the particles of the precious Body, the particles of the saints, and those of the living and the dead into the holy chalice was originally done without "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..."[1397] and the remaining resurrectional troparia, namely, the ninth ode of the canon of Pascha, being said by the deacon, or in his absence, by the priest. In the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, as well as in other manuscripts, the care that the deacon must have when transferring the particles from the paten to the holy chalice is strongly emphasized, so that "none of the fragments" might fall or remain ("next the deacon gathers and puts the remains into the chalice," or in a more detailed manner, "and after this the deacon takes the holy paten with his hand and the so-called mousa and wipes all of them into the holy chalice with fear and every care, so that none of them fall or are remaining").[1398] While doing this action with extreme caution, he seems to say absolutely nothing. The custom of the priest not leaving time empty during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, but of filling the intervening gaps between the prayers with various troparia known from memory and for the most part related to what is being celebrated, must have already begun in the period of Saint Philotheos (fourteenth century), but later peaked and reached excesses. At this point, the well-known, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...," and the ninth ode of Pascha are present in printed editions. They properly fit into the whole resurrectional climate of the Divine Liturgy, the joyous Paschal atmosphere, which is a result of participation in the undefiled mysteries, and in the symbolisms that see, at this point of the Di-

1394. "Ἀπόπλυνον, Κύριε..."

1395. "φυλλάδες."

1396. See questions 460 and 461. For another viewpoint on this question, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. VI, The Communion, Thanksgiving and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 720–752. On the particles, see also questions 180, 181, 182, 518, and 529.

1397. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."

1398. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 14.

vine Liturgy, the Resurrection of Christ through the union of the precious Body and Blood in the chalice and through communion. Apparently, the troparia were attracted there for the Lord's promise concerning staying with his disciples "until the ends of the age"[1399] (compare also "Always, now and ever...,"[1400] which is said after holy communion) and the entreaty that we "more manifestly"[1401] enjoy the partaking of Christ in the day without evening of his kingdom. These troparia have been introduced later, but not unsuccessfully. Of course, they are successful as long as the deacon has memorized them, and his attention is not distracted from his very responsible and sacred task by searching or looking in the service book at the same time.

In the printed edition of the Hieratikon from 1977, edited by Father Kōnstantinos Platanitēs of eternal memory, quite a few insertions were made into the traditional text of the Liturgies and especially of the standard rubrics, which are set out, as it is well known, with red letters. That edition was eventually withdrawn but created many problems. One of them was the addition after the troparion, "O Great Pascha...,"[1402] of the small prayer, "Wash away, O Lord, by your Holy Blood, the sins of your servants who are here remembered, through the intercessions of the Theotokos and of all your saints. Amen."[1403] This prayer is encountered with certain variations ("Wash away, O Lord, the sins of those remembered in the holy sac-

1399. "μέχρι τερμάτων αἰῶνος" (Matthew 20:28) is also taken from the resurrectional troparion of the ninth ode for Pascha, "Ὢ θείας, ὢ φίλης, ὢ γλυκυτάτης σου φωνῆς· μεθ' ἡμῶν ἀψευδῶς γάρ, ἐπηγγείλω ἔσεσθαι, μέχρι τερμάτων αἰῶνος Χριστέ, ἣν οἱ πιστοί, ἄγκυραν ἐλπίδος, κατέχοντες ἀγαλλόμεθα."

1400. "Πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί."

1401. "ἐκτυπώτερον," is taken from the resurrectional troparion of the ninth ode for Pascha, "Ὢ Πάσχα τὸ μέγα, καὶ ἱερώτατον Χριστέ· ὢ σοφία καὶ Λόγε, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δύναμις· δίδου ἡμῖν ἐκτυπώτερον, σοῦ μετασχεῖν, ἐν τῇ ἀνεσπέρῳ, ἡμέρᾳ τῆς βασιλείας σου."

1402. "Ὢ Πάσχα τὸ μέγα..."

1403. "Ἄπόπλυνον, Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐνθάδε μνημονευθέντων δούλων σου τῷ αἵματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ· πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων σου τῶν ἁγίων. Ἀμήν," *Ἱερατικόν, Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυστοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῆς τυπικῆς αὐτῶν Διατάξεως καὶ τίνων ἀπαραιτήτων Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθίων, Τάξεων, καὶ Εὐχῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1977), 135.

rifice, through the intercession of your saints"[1404] or "Through your Precious Blood, O Lord, and through the prayers of your saints, wash away the sins of those here remembered"[1405]) in the Slavonic liturgical books, from which the editor introduced it. They are not encountered in the Greek manuscripts and printed editions, a matter that indicates its even later insertion. Certainly, a pious text, but an inappropriate one. It is inappropriate not because the offering of the particles in the Divine Liturgy is not done for an atonement of the sins for those who are commemorated. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (who is the preeminent mystagogue on the subject of the particles, which in the era at that time reached its complete development) writes very characteristically "that the offered particles provide great advantage, for they are in place of persons for whom they are offered, and are a sacrifice offered on their behalf to God…those for the faithful who have fallen asleep, are for the remission of sins, and the union of divine grace, while those for the living, provided they lead lives of repentance, are for the deliverance from torments, for the forgiveness of sins, and for hope of eternal life…And for the faithful…an imparting of divine mercy" (*Explanation* 102).[1406] And elsewhere, he states: "However, the particles are not transformed into either the Master's Body or into the bodies of the saints, but they are only gifts and offerings and sacrifices by means of bread in imitation of the Master and are offered to Him in the name of the saints. They are sanctified by the sacred-service of the mysteries, by the union, and by communion,[1407] and pass along holiness to those

---

1404. "Ἀπόπλυνον Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν μνημονευθέντων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ θυσίᾳ, τῇ πρεσβείᾳ τῶν ἁγίων σου."

1405. "Διὰ τοῦ τιμίου σου αἵματος, Κύριε, καὶ διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων σου πλῦνον τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν ἐδῶ μνημονευθέντων."

1406. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 158–161. The text of Hawkes-Teeples has "*Καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις… θείου ἐλέους χορηγεῖται μετάδοσις*/And for the saints… an imparting of divine mercy is provided."

1407. In the same paragraph, Symeōn later states, "For they share immaterially and spiritually in the communion of Christ by their souls, then also through His sacred-service, which He has handed down to take place for the world, they share the greatest glory, as fellow laborers and those glorified with Him," Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 218–219

for whom they are offered" (*Dialogue*, chapter 94).[1408] The offering of particles has been done in the proskomidē and the participation in sanctification has been already brought about. The insertion at the end of the sacred-service is now untimely. But even more incorrect is the fact that this prayer is put into the mouth of the deacon and that it is supposed to be done by him. The deacon serves, he does not pray.[1409] He does not have the authority to do this. He is a servant of the mysteries not an officiant.[1410]

See also above in the answer to question 529, where a reference to this subject incidentally takes place, in the synodal letter of Patriarch Paisios I (1651–1652 and 1654–1655) to Nikon of Moscow.

592

During the service of Matins for feasts, why is the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone ("From my youth..." and so forth)[1411] chanted two times for each troparion, while during the Sunday Matins the anabathmoi for each tone of the Oktōēchos are chanted once?

According to the prevailing taxis, the anabathmoi of the tone of the Oktōēchos during the service of Sunday Matins are chanted once, namely one time for each troparion. However, the troparia of the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone, which are chanted during feasts, are chanted twice. There also exists another smaller difference; the troparion that refers to the Holy Spirit and is chanted during the "Glory..." is not doubled, but the same troparion of the second antiphon ("By the Holy Spirit, the streams of grace gush forth...")[1412] of the fourth tone is also chanted at "Both now...."

The observation of the questioner is precise and the purpose of the question, apart from the rationale of the practice and its theo-

1408. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 218–219.

1409. "Ο διάκονος διακονεῖ, δὲν εὔχεται."

1410. "Εἶναι διάκονος τῶν μυστηρίων ὄχι ἱερουργός."

1411. "Ἐκ νεότητός μου..."

1412. "Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἀναβλύζει..."

retical justification, probably is practical. Namely, what is the reason that the anabathmoi of the fourth tone are chanted two times during feasts and not once, as on Sundays. Generally, in parish practice, the tendency exists for the troparia not to be chanted two times for time saving and with the pretext that the repetition is not cared for by the people. Nevertheless, ecclesiastical taxis is clearly in favor of repetitions. And this is observed not only in the practice of monasteries, which are justifiably in favor of the extension of the service and where time obligations and constraints do not exist. The repetitions are greater and more characteristic in ancient parish practice, which came into being in the cities and was in force in the parish temples of the cities and villages. Indeed, from this practice, characteristic hymns originate in the contemporary common—parish and monastic—Typikon, which are not only repeated two times, but many times, such as the prokeimena, "Arise, O God..."[1413] and "Christ is risen from the dead..."[1414] with their verses, "Let my prayer be set forth..."[1415] of the Presanctified, the trisagion hymn, the apolytikia, the hypakoes "You were born secretly..."[1416] and so forth during the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany, and so forth. According to the ancient wise saying, repetition is the mother of learning.[1417] Thus, the people only had to listen, understand, memorize, and participate in the service. Otherwise, the "richness" of worship, with the great number of alternating troparia, turns into poverty for the people, and worship, from a work of the people of God, turns into an affair of a priest and a chanter.

Especially in the repetition of the troparia of the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone during the Matins for feasts, it appears that the old and venerable taxis is preserved, according to which, the anabathmoi of all tones during Sunday Matins were chanted twice. According to the strict taxis, the anabathmoi are so chanted up until nowadays on the Holy

1413. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός..."
1414. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν..."
1415. "Κατευθυνθήτω..."
1416. "Λαθὼν ἐτέχθης..."
1417. "repetitio mater studiorum est."

Mountain. According to the more ancient practice, which is absent nowadays, the corresponding verse from the odes of the anabathmoi of the Psalter (the 'To the Lord,'[1418] Psalms 119–133), of which the anabathmoi of the Oktōēchos constitute a kind of poetic commentary, preceded each troparion. In the Typikon–Hōrologion of the Monastery of Kryptopherrēs,[1419] we read,

Λέγομεν ἐν μὲν τῇ Κυριακῇ τοὺς ἀναβαθμοὺς κατὰ τὸν ἦχον· ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἑορταῖς, λέγομεν τὸ α΄ ἀντίφωνον τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν τοῦ δ΄ ἤχου.	While on Sunday, we say the anabathmoi according to tone, on the other feasts, we say the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone.
Ἐκ νεότητός μου...	From my youth...
Στίχ. α΄. Πλεονάκις ἐπολέμησάν με... [Ψαλμ. ρκη΄ 1][1420]	First Verse. Often, they made war against me... [Psalm 128:1]
[Ἐκ νεότητός μου...]	[From my youth...]
Οἱ μισοῦντες Σιών...	You the haters of Zion...
Στίχ. β΄. Αἰσχυνθήτωσαν καὶ ἀποστραφήτωσαν πάντες. [Ψαλμ. ρκη΄ 5]	Second Verse. Let all be put to shame and turned backward. [Psalm 128:5]
[Οἱ μισοῦντες Σιών...]	[You the haters of Zion...]
Δόξα καὶ νῦν...	Glory both now...
Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ζωοῦται...	By the Holy Spirit, every soul is restored to life...

1418. The eighteenth kathisma (Psalms 119–133) is called the "To the Lord" ("τὰ Πρὸς Κύριον," or "τὰ προσκύρια," according to certain manuscripts) from the beginning phrase "To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted..." ("Πρὸς Κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐκέκραξα...") of Psalm 119.

1419. *Ὡρολόγιον σὺν Θεῷ Ἁγίῳ περιέχον τὴν ἡμερονύκτιον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἀκολουθίαν τῆς Ἱερᾶς καὶ περιβλέπτου Μονῆς τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης* (Ἐν Κρυπτοφέρρῃ: n.p., 1950), 46–47. "Ἡ Μονὴ τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης" is the Monastery of Grottaferrata founded in 1004 and located near Rome. For a comparative study of this edition with others, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "Αἱ ἀκολουθίαι τῶν ὡρῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου κατὰ τὸ ὡρολόγιον τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης, ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὸ Κωνσταντινουπολιτικὸν ὡρολόγιον" in *La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo. Atti del Convegno storico interecclesiale (Bari, 30 aprile-4 maggio 1969)*, Italia Sacra, 22 (Padova: Antenore, 1972), 2:579–588.

1420. Corrected in the text from "128:5" to "128:1."

593

In the troparion of the funereal Trisagion, "Ἡ μόνη ἁγνὴ καὶ ἄχραντος Παρθένος, ἡ Θεὸν ἀφράστως κυήσασα, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν" (The only pure and undefiled Virgin, who inexpressibly gave birth to God, intercede for our souls to be saved), different variations are often heard in its text: "ἀσπόρως," (without seed) instead of "ἀφράστως" (inexpressibly), "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐλεηθῆναι" (for [our souls] to receive mercy) or "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐλεηθῆναι καὶ συγχωρηθῆναι" (for [our souls] to receive mercy and to be forgiven) instead of "τοῦ σωθῆναι" (for [our souls] to be saved). From where did these variations originate, and which is the correct text?

A general and self-evident principle is that often-used texts, and especially those from memory, are corrupted more than others that are rarely used and which, for this reason, are read or chanted "from parchments,"[1421] namely, from the book. Especially the above theotokion of the funereal Trisagion, particularly due to frequent use, is well known to all from memory and is chanted not only inside the temple, but also at graves and in other circumstances, where the use of a book is difficult if not also impossible. Consequently, corruption is natural and expected. But these variations are not only done from memory but have also influenced printed editions. From what I able to know, in the manuscripts and at least most printed editions, the disputed points of the texts are: "ἡ Θεὸν ἀσπόρως κυήσασα, πρέσβευε τοῦ σωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ δούλου σου" (who gave birth without seed to God, intercede for the soul of your servant to be saved) or in the plural, "τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δούλων σου" (the souls of your servants). This must also be the original text. The meaning is complete. In certain printed editions, instead of "σωθῆναι" (to be saved) one encounters "ἐλεηθῆναι" (to receive mercy). But in others, "ὑπέρ" (for) is also added ("ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωθῆναι" or "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐλεηθῆναι"), which without being an error, probably seems excessive, since within the "πρέσβευε" (intercede) the meaning of "ὑπέρ" (for) exists, ("πρεσβεύω ὑπὲρ τινός," I intercede for someone). As for the addition "καὶ συγχωρηθῆναι,"

1421. "ἀπὸ διφθέρας."

(and to be forgiven), it probably originates from piety, without a particular reason existing. In the salvation and mercy sought from God, the forgiveness of sins is understood to be included as well as everything else the love of God has in store. In any case, the entreaty that matters more and is expressed in the previous three troparia is repose for the soul of the one fallen asleep, which is absent from the theotokion. In addition, it is not of the same syllables or accents with the three other troparia, nor follows a common automelon in order to show in a comparative manner whether the meter of the troparion is disrupted by these otherwise attractive changes of wording ("ἐλεηθῆναι" [to receive mercy] instead of the original "σωθῆναι" [to be saved]) and the addition of "ὑπέρ" (for) as well as that of "καὶ συγχωρηθῆναι," (and to be forgiven).

However, the same thing does not occur with the change of the adverb, "ἀσπόρως" (without seed) with "ἀφράστως" (inexpressibly). From what we said, the original reading is the first ("ἀσπόρως"), but the change was done and is done arbitrarily for pseudo-pious reasons, from a foolish modesty that characterizes the "decent" Christians of our period. It not only passed into certain unofficial printed editions, but also into the unreliable edition of the Hieratikon from 1977.[1422] And it does not influence the meter, the number of syllables, and the placement of the accents of the troparion (three syllables, where the middle one, "ἀσπόρως"– "ἀφράστως," is accented), a thing that shows how well it is thought out and that the change was made by a learned editor. However, this unacceptable tendency to fear words and to change biblical text lest "we soil our mouths"[1423] is annoying. "Ἀσπόρως," (without seed) is encountered in dozens of theotokia and other texts of hymnography and the Euchologion, in which the hymnographers and other sacred writers speak in an unaffected manner with the humble and sincere language of the saint,[1424]

1422. *Ἱερατικόν, Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυστοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῆς τυπικῆς αὐτῶν Διατάξεως καὶ τίνων ἀπαραιτήτων Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθίων, Τάξεων, καὶ Εὐχῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1977), 287.

1423. "λερώσουμε τὸ στόμα μας."

1424. In other words, the language of the saint, who is the subject of the troparia and which expresses his or her life in an unadulterated manner.

which suits the seriousness and the modest decency of divine worship. Thus, also Blessed Theoktistē the Lesbian (ἡ Λεσβία)[1425] was renamed for the more decent, "the one from Lesbos"[1426] or "the Mithymnian"![1427]

Speaking of the reason for the additions to the funereal troparia, let me mention something that I heard two times in different places, but which I pray does not have wider dissemination. In each troparion of the four above, the name of the one who had fallen asleep was added after "τοῦ δούλου σου" (your servant), which the one celebrating read from the inscription of the grave. And while this moved the relatives of the deceased, who each time erupted in wailing, it did not assist in the maintenance of the civil climate of divine worship. The liturgical texts must not be changed with additions or corrections according to one's whim, which leads to abuses and excesses.

594

Why is the gospel read during the Divine Liturgy by the deacon, but throughout all the other services of the mysteries and so forth by the priest or by the hierarch?

In the answer to question 508, (which concerned whether "And that we may be deemed worthy..."[1428] or only, "Wisdom, arise...,"[1429] precedes the gospel reading of the Presanctified for the first three days of Great Week), we attempted to explain the disunity that is observed in the tradition regarding who originally the reader of the pericope was. Namely, if it was the deacon, as in the Divine Liturgy, the introduction of the reading with "And that we may be deemed worthy..." was unnecessary. However, if it was the priest,

1425. Here, the original meaning of the word "ἡ Λεσβία" simply expresses the fact that the Blessed Theoktistē was a ninth century ascetical saint from the island of Lesbos. Phountoulēs is using this example to show how modern cognates influence changes in texts.

1426. "ἡ ἀπὸ Λέσβου."

1427. "ἡ Μηθυμναία." Mithymna (Μήθυμνα) is a town on the island of Lesbos.

1428. "Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ἡμᾶς..."

1429. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί..."

as in the readings of the gospel outside of the Divine Liturgy, then the deacon's interjection is very logical and imperative to draw the people's attention on its account, which in the three instances above[1430] was—and is—unusual and, in some manner, "unpredictable." Namely, neither an epistle reading, as in the Liturgies, nor a double prokeimenon, as in Matins, precedes the gospel reading. Indeed, we saw in a very serious and trustworthy witness of the tradition of the Holy Sepulcher, in the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection from the year 1122 (*Codex Timiou Staurou Hierosolymōn 43*), that the gospel readings in these three instances are read on the one hand by the Patriarch himself during Vespers–Presanctified of Great Tuesday, but on the other by the archdeacon or the deacon during Great Monday and Great Wednesday.[1431] The Typikon above is only partially preserved, namely, from Palm Sunday up until the Saturday of Renewal Week. In all the readings of the gospel pericopes, which are provided for during these days in Vespers, in Matins, in the Divine Liturgy, in the procession of Palm Sunday, in the consecration of chrism and in the washing of the feet during Great Thursday, and during the service of the Holy Passions and during the Great Hours of Great Friday, the same largely inexplicable variety with the Presanctifieds of the first three days as to the reader/gospeler is observed. Sometimes, the archdeacon or deacon reads the pericope, but at other times, while many deacons are present, the patriarch himself, the prōtopapas, or the second ranked[1432] (priest). In any case, the practice generally in force is nearly the contemporary one with different variations and exceptions. Namely, that while in the Divine Liturgy the gospel is read by the deacon, it is read in other instances (Vespers, Matins, processions, washing of feet, Great Hours, and so forth) by the patriarch–bishop or priest, even if deacons participate in the service.

1430. The first three days of Great Week.

1431. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας, 2:63, 46, and 80.

1432. "δευτεράριος." The word also means one who ranks after the abbot (ἡγούμενος) in a monastery and acts as his representative. If taken with this meaning, the word in parentheses "(priest)" would then indicate that this applies only if the second ranked is a priest as well.

According to the relatively modern practice, where the celebration of the sacred mysteries or sacred rites (such as baptism, marriage, Hagiasmoi, processions, funeral service, and so forth) has been detached from the Divine Liturgy, with which originally it was connected, the gospel reading is read by the first ranked celebrant—the bishop or the priest first in rank—or in the case of additional readings, such as in unction or in the service of the Holy Passions, by the bishop or priest first in rank and then according to taxis by the remaining ones. This practice could be a solution/key for our question, if it was not relatively later and was not caused by the rareness of deacons, which during modern times was a customary phenomenon. Namely, when there is no deacon, the priest said the gospel reading in these instances, such as in the Divine Liturgy, and this eventually became prevalent as the normal taxis.

However, perhaps the solution to the question above is found elsewhere. The reading of the sacred gospel in all instances is a fact of utmost importance, a revelation of God's will, which is done with every solemnity, a crowning point of the Church's synaxis, and an announcement of God's divine and blessed purposes; and decrees, according to Saint Maximos the confessor[1433] (*Mystagogy* 10),[1434] "the coming of the Son of God" and Theophany, according to Saint Germanos of Constantinople (*Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*),[1435] since "He [Christ] is perceived to be speaking

1433. Saint Maximos the Confessor (ca. 580–662) was a major Church Father whose writings were highly influential in Byzantine theology. His work, *Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μυσταγωγίας* (Concerning Ecclesiastical Mystagogy), is a commentary on the Liturgy. For its text, Phountoulēs most likely used PG 91:657–718. The critical edition is found in Christian Boudignon, ed., *Maximi Confessoris Mystagogia una cum Latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii*, CCSG 69 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011); and an English translation in Jonathan J. Armstrong, trans., *On the Ecclesiastical Mystagogy - A Theological Vision of the Liturgy* (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2019). Armstrong bases his translation on the critical edition, which is reproduced in his work, and provides an overview of the work as well as a bibliography.

1434. Saint Maximos the Confessor, Mystagogy 10 in *On the Ecclesiastical Mystagogy - A Theological Vision of the Liturgy*, trans. Jonathan J. Armstrong (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2019), 74.

1435. PG 98:412d; Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 80–81.

through the Gospel," according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Explanation* 69).[1436] Thus, its reading would be more suitable to be done by the celebrant himself and the priest first in rank of the synaxis than by the deacon. It is very possible that in the instances of a reading of a gospel pericope outside of the Liturgy the more ancient and, according to the above, more correct practice, or at least, the practice anticipated as more natural, was preserved. However, how can the interjection of the deacon and the reading by him of the gospel pericope during the Divine Liturgy from the ambōn (a practice completely and unquestionably attested to) be explained?

As an established rule, in certain very sacred and often not repeated instances, the oldest liturgical customs are preserved that can direct us to the solution of many ceremonial questions. In the present case: In the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection, which we mentioned at the beginning, at almost the simultaneous time (from the year 1131) in a Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior of Messina (*Codex Messina 115*) and in the Typikon of the Great Church of Saint Sophia of Constantinople about two hundred years earlier (*Codex Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*), the following illuminating standard rubric exists regarding the gospel reading of the Divine Liturgy of Pascha (John 1:1–17): "Gospel according to John, the beginning. The deacon says the Roman one [namely, the Latin one] and after the completion of the Roman gospel reading, the patriarch *says the peace and the deacon says 'Wisdom, let us attend,' and the patriarch starts,* 'In the beginning was the Word.' The deacon, who stands on the ambōn, while listening well, more clearly says what was read by the patriarch up until its completion" (Typikon of Saint Sophia).[1437] "It is necessary to know that the patriarch [of Jerusalem] ought to read this gospel on his synthronon and the archdeacon on the ambōn; and whatever the patriarch says, this also the archdeacon

1436. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 120–121,

1437. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2:94–95. An error occurred in the quotation that omitted the section italicized and contains the word, "ἔρχεται" (he comes) not in the text, in place of "εἰρηνεύει ὁ πατριάρχης, καὶ λέγει ὁ διάκονος· Σοφία πρόσχωμεν, καὶ ἄρχεται." The omitted text from the Typikon is translated here to avoid confusion.

says until the end of the gospel" (Typikon of the Temple of the Resurrection).[1438] "This [the gospel of Pascha] is read within the bēma by the presider or by the first presbyter on the synthronon. But it is said in turn by the deacon outside on the ambōn, when reciting the same reading which the former said within" (Typikon of the Savior of Messina).[1439] Certainly, this is about a special practice that is not done only for festive reasons, but also for practical ones. It must be possible for the pericope to be heard during a large synaxis, such as that of the Sunday of Pascha. At the time, there did not exist technical means to accomplish it as nowadays. The deacon was young and the ambōn was in the middle of the temple. Thus, apparently it became prevalent for the gospel reading (for the reasons above) to be said during large synaxes by the deacon for reasons, originally at least, acoustical alone. Evidence of this is also the analogous double reading of the gospel by the priest first in rank or bishop, according to the original tradition, and the repetitions of the words of the pericope by the deacon during the processions, in which many people participated. This is attested to by the Typikon of the Great Church for the procession of September 25 in Constantinople during the commemoration "of the terrifying events that took place with love of humankind announcing the Resurrection prior to the Resurrection"[1440] ("And the patriarch receives the gospel book and exclaims,

1438. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας, 2:201.

1439. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 250.

1440. This commemoration is based on a legend concerning the origins of the trisagion hymn, according to which God brought about an earthquake on September 25, 438 to cause the people of Constantinople to learn and chant the hymn. The earthquake was celebrated annually with a procession. For the legend and its effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147. For other discussions of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey,

'The reading is from the Gospel according to Luke,' chapter 83... And while the patriarch reads, the deacon standing near to him exclaims while crying out what was recited, in this manner: 'At that time, Jesus got into a boat...'[1441]."[1442] Compare also a procession of June 5, for the commemoration of the invasion of barbarians/Avars during the reign of Hērakleios on June 6, 617[1443]). The Typikon of Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki provides for the same things also for the procession of the Indiction (September 1): "Here [during the alleluia] the Great Chartophylax takes kairos when about to say with the hierarch the gospel reading...When the deacon says, 'In peace, let us attend,' the hierarch begins to read the gospel. The Great Chartophylax listens to what was recited by the hierarch, when also himself saying the same things at that time" (*Codex Athens 2047,* f. 84v).

"Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

1441. Luke 8:22–25.

1442. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 1:46–47.

1443. Hērakleios, emperor (610–641). For additional information on the commemoration, see Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 1:306–307. On the Avars, see Walter Pohl, *The Avars: A Steppe Empire in Central Europe, 567–822* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2018) and Georgios Kardaras, *Byzantium and the Avars: 6th–9th Century AD: Political, Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, vol. 51 (Boston, MA: Brill, 2019).

595

According to the Typikon, when a commemoration of a saint who does not have a doxastikon coincides on a Sunday, while three hesperia[1444] and the canon are chanted, the kontakion, oikos, apolytikion, and exaposteilarion (if the saint has one) are omitted. In cases of saints that are celebrated by Christians (for example, Saint Sophia, Saint Stylianos, and others)[1445] must not also these troparia in honor of the saints be inserted into the service, even in violation of the Typikon in force?[1446]

The question is worthy of special attention and study because the positions that are expressed in it have strong grounds, but also equally have a strong response. In the first place, it must be acknowledged that, as the services of the Mēnologion have stabilized in the Mēnaia in use, they express a past era's honoring, and usually of a specific region, for the saints. The criterion that regulates the liturgical honoring of a saint, its level,[1447] and consequently the proportionate insertion of his/her troparia into the Sunday service is whether or not they have a doxastikon in the Mēnaion. The criterion is not arbitrary, but objective and required. Sunday is a feast of the Lord, the weekly Pascha of the Church, and it is inconceivable for its resurrectional

---

1444. "Τὰ ἑσπέρια" are the troparia that follow "Lord I have cried to you..." ("Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ...") during Vespers. Customarily, these hesperia are also inserted in Matins during lauds.

1445. These are cases when a saint is locally celebrated on his/her feast out of affinity and spiritual obligation to the saint, when a person has been named after the saint, or when a temple has been consecrated in the saint's name. Often a full service does not exist in the Mēnaion or is even completely omitted (as is the case with all the commemorations of the new martyrs), but the Mēnaion's service is supplemented by special service books (φυλλάδες). Such saints are normally celebrated "πανηγυρικῶς" ("festively"), which implies a celebration with a complete Liturgy as well as an Artoklasia. This festive type of celebration is distinguished from a simple "commemoration" (μνήμη). The question here concerns a saint that would have been celebrated "festively," with a full Liturgy, but in this case the celebration coincides with a Sunday on which the Liturgy is normally celebrated. In such cases, the Typikon does not appear to accommodate local popular preferences.

1446. See also questions 131, 154, 173, 174, 341, 342, 343, 369, 404, 421, and 507.

1447. Namely, of honor or importance.

character to be overshadowed or to be relegated to second place by the feasts of saints celebrated or not. When the saint is beloved by the people and celebrated, his/her service is chanted with the resurrectional one always according to the specifications of the Typikon, with the priority always given to the Sunday service. The canon for the Matins, as well as the three stichēra for Vespers, have been set as a boundary for all the saints. A sufficient and beneficial boundary, which together with the Mēnologion's hypomnēma[1448] that is always also said during these great movable feasts of the Lord and during the Holy Pascha itself, provides the required space for the commemoration and the pertinent honoring of the saint of the day. Beyond that, the doxastikon was set as a criterion. For better or worse, this is another subject. In any case, some criterion ought somehow to be set in order for the leveling of the Heortologion to be avoided and for excesses to be curtailed, to which popular piety and honoring of saints is inclined. This intervention is not done for the saints to be undervalued, but in order for the delicate balance and gravity to be maintained in the course of the feasts of the year and for the unwritten "prerogatives of Sunday" (for us to use an expression dear to the Kollybades) to be safeguarded, namely, the emphasis and the prominence of the fact of the Lord's Resurrection.[1449]

The problem is found elsewhere, as we noted above. Saints who are nowadays not honored have doxastika (although the honoring of old saints has currently been rekindled for various reasons) or other saints who are today particularly honored do not have the respective service in the Mēnaion, and new martyrs and newly revealed saints are completely absent in the liturgical books in use. Thus, for us to stay with extreme examples, there does not exist a service in the Mēnaia for Saint Nektarios, for Saints Raphaēl, Nikolaos, and Eirēnē,[1450] or for the new martyrs. The services of Saint Eleutherios, Saint Paraskevē, and Saint Stylianos are incomplete in the

1448. "ὑπόμνημα." An extract from the Mēnologion or Synaxarion by which the feast or commemoration of the day is made known.

1449. For an extensive discussion of the "prerogatives of Sunday," see question 546.

1450. These three saints are examples of newly revealed ones, in this case, from Thermi of Lesbos.

Mēnaia with respect to the requirements for their honoring nowadays. The examples could be multiplied. In any case, it is a fact that even though, as we said, the honoring of the saints in the Mēnaia expresses the liturgical needs of an older era and another place—obviously of Constantinople of the later Byzantine period—they constitute the plank of salvation and the measure for maintaining the liturgical taxis in a predicted and looming flood.[1451] For those who know matters, I think it is clear what I mean.

In the manuscripts, there exist a multitude of services for saints that are not contained in the Mēnaia. Helenē Papaëliopoulou-Phōtopoulou has made a thorough investigation and pointed out 899 canons in the libraries of manuscripts of the East, which remain unpublished (*A register of unpublished Byzantine "asmatic" canons*, Athens 1996).[1452]

In Rome, hundreds of canons have been critically published by I. Sciro and his collaborators on the basis of Italo-Greek manuscripts, as if they were the supplements for the Mēnaia (*Analecta Hymnica Graeca*, Roma, 1966–1980).[1453]

In addition, a numberless multitude of services for saints have been independently published in service books[1454] to supplement the deficiencies of the Mēnaia in old services or to create new ones from scratch for those saints, old or modern, who did not have a service. In 1926, Louis Petit, an important scholar and Latin archbishop of Athens at the time, edited a directory of independent services that had been published up until that time. This is a monumental work, *Bibliography of Greek Services*, (in French) Brussels 1926, in 308 pages, which recorded approximately a thousand services that had

1451. Phountoulēs is referring to the possible "flood" of services (old unincorporated ones and those newly written and published in independent "services books," φυλλάδες) that could potentially overwhelm the Mēnaia.

1452. Ἑλένη Παπαηλιοπούλου-Φωτοπούλου, *Ταμεῖον ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ᾀσματικῶν κανόνων: Seu analecta hymnica graeca e codicibus eruta orientis christiani* (Ἀθῆναι: Σύλλογος πρὸς Ὠφελίμων Βιβλίων, 1996).

1453. Ioseph Schirò et al, eds., *Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae Inferioris* (Roma: Istituto di studi bizanti e neoellenici, 1966-1983). Through its organization according to the liturgical calendar, this work gives the appearance of providing daily supplements to the Mēnaia.

1454. "φυλλάδες."

been published in various cities (Alexandria, Athens, Holy Mountain, Bucharest, Cairo, Kalamata, Chios, Constantinople, Patra, Smyrna, Venice, and elsewhere) from the discovery of printing onwards.[1455] From 1926 up until nowadays, a great number of services were written (often full and festive) and dozens have been published in individual service books. It is said that Father Gerasimos Mikragiannanitēs,[1456] a hymnographer of the Great Church of Christ, alone wrote two thousand such services and countless troparia, apolytikia, kontakia, megalynaria, and so forth. Apart from that elder of eternal memory, many others also wrote, and write and publish, services for coverage of the gaps in hymnography. This is an important production, which is an example of the height of this hymnological form, and which obviously covers a need, the honoring of saints similarly found in bloom and—self-evidently—the deficiency for coverage of their needs (actual or presumed) by the Mēnaia in use. And as long as these services remain, in some manner, on the periphery of universal liturgical practice, I think it is a good thing for them to be occasionally and exceptionally used, wherever local, old, or new martyr saints are honored, or wherever the temple is honored in the name of an old saint, but the service of the Mēnaion is not sufficient for the celebration of his or her commemoration. The problem is what will be done if these services, old or modern, tried or untried, begin to claim places in the Mēnaia. This is about the "flood" that we mentioned, the "flood of Noah." The cracks already began in the Hōrologion, Egkolpion of the Reader, and even in modern publications of the Mēnaia. Apolytikia, kontakia, and megalynaria arrived

1455. Louis Petit, *Bibliographie des acolouthies grecques*, Subsidia hagiographica 16 (Bruxelles, Société des Bollandistes, 1926).

1456. Γεράσιμος Μικραγιαννανίτης (1905–1991), a monk of the Skete of Small Saint Anna on the Holy Mountain and one of the most important hymnographers of modern times, was recognized with the title, "Hymnographer of the Great Church of Christ." For basic bibliography, see Π. Β. Πάσχος, *"Ὑμνηπόλος Ἐράσμιος": Ὁ Ὑμνογράφος τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας Γέρασιμος Μοναχὸς Μικραγιαννανίτης* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Σκήτη Μικρὰς Ἁγίας Ἄννης, 1992) and Θεόκλητος Μοναχὸς Διονυσιάτης, *Γέρασιμος Μοναχὸς Μικραγιαννανίτης, Ὑμνογράφος τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ὀργανισμὸς Πολιτιστικῆς Πρωτεύουσας τῆς Εὐρώπης, Ἱερὰ Κοινότητα Ἁγίου Ὄρους, 1997).

in heaps and the old simple taxis has been disrupted, which did not suffer from a lack of troparia, but which retained moderation and propriety for serious and specific reasons. We wrote extensively about the apolytikia (I wonder vainly?) in the answer to question 507. The same things and worse apply regarding the megalynaria. When both the existing "antibodies" and resistance of the still living tradition are missing, then the priests and the chanters in the name of the liturgical books will abolish tradition by chanting apolytikia for all the saints, marginalizing the traditional troparia of venerable antiquity and well-known to the whole body of the Church, or abandoning the mystery of the Divine Eucharist and inserting "megalynaria," in large part inelegant and unmusical, at the crucial point of the Divine Liturgy in honor of the saint, celebrated or not.

Lest what was written be considered exaggerated, let us mention a classical example of such a "corrected" Mēnaion for April, which was published in 1949 in Athens. The pious editor embarked with wonderful diligence on the study of the manuscripts of the National Library of Greece and tried not to let anything be lost from the richness of the hymnological tradition. However, the result was truly tragic. I mention only some examples without comment: The Vespers of April 12 has fifteen stichēra prosomoia at "Lord, I have cried to you."[1457] The Matins of the same day has four canons and five kathismata of the third ode, aside from the theotokia. The Vespers of April 14 not only has ten prosomoia, but Matins four kontakia, two oikoi, and three exaposteilaria. The Vespers of the 16th has twelve stichēra, four kathismata of the third ode, and two theotokia. The Vespers of the 18th has thirteen stichēra, six aposticha, and two doxastika, the Matins three kontakia. The 20th has fifteen stichēra, four canons in the Matins, four mesōdia kathismata. The feast of Saint Geōrgios (April 23), six aposticha in the Vespers, seven kathismata, and three canons. In addition, the services for the new martyrs of the month are also inserted into their places, as well as services for other saints with the service of day, in order for them to be chanted "in the

1457. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ."

Complines."[1458] This is a proper "storehouse,"[1459] or to a lesser extent, a "museum"[1460] of useful and useless, in any case venerable, liturgical material. However, the Mēnaia are useful books of the Church, and their content should be coordinated with the Typikon and not with our personal piety or with our academic preferences.

And for us to conclude this extensive answer by summarizing the points above. Certainly, the Mēnaia have their deficiencies. It is preferable for us to endure them than for the liturgical tradition and taxis to be overwhelmed by the multitude of troparia and individual festive services. Let them be used very sparingly, when the temple celebrates or when the commemoration of a local saint is put forward or even when one of the beloved old saints is honored, especially by the people. At that time, also let the chanting of the individual elements be regulated always on the basis of the wise restraining direction of the Typikon, namely, whether its doxastikon is chanted or not.

596

I have observed that in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain during the service of the typika in Great Lent, when they have a Presanctified, they omit the "Our Father..." – "For yours is the kingdom...."[1461] Why is it not said? Which one is correct?

This is a seemingly insignificant case, which, if studied, reveals to us the power and the memory of our liturgical tradition and taxis, before which one remains ecstatic.

Indeed, during Great Lent, the service of the typika, which is found in our Hōrologia after the Sixth Hour and prior to the service of the trapeza, is inserted just before the end of the Ninth Hour during the days of the Fast.[1462] We recall the well-known taxis that

1458. "ἐν τοῖς ἀποδείπνοις."
1459. "ἀποθήκη."
1460. "μουσεῖον."
1461. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..." – "Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν..."
1462. The typika are inserted just before the conclusion of the Ninth Hour since there is only one trapeza on fasting days. See question 565 for a discus-

after the troparia, "The thief when looking...,"[1463] "In the middle of two thieves...,"[1464] and "The one who bore the lamb and the shepherd...,"[1465] of the Ninth Hour, the following is said: "Lord have mercy," forty times, "Glory both now," "More honorable,"[1466] "In the name of the Lord....,"[1467] "Through the prayers..."[1468] is said by the priest instead of "O God have compassion on us....,"[1469] and immediately inserted are the Beatitudes, "The heavenly chorus..."[1470] and so forth, the Symbol of Faith, "Forgive, remit...,"[1471] the "Our Father...," "For yours is the kingdom...," and the kontakia from the service of the typika. With the "Lord have mercy" forty times, and so forth, we return to the conclusion of the Ninth Hour. The same rubric is also observed during the first three days of Great Week, but in the monasteries also during Great Thursday and Great Saturday, and moreover during the services of the Great Hours of Great Friday and the eves of the Nativity and Theophany.

According to the question, the "Our Father" is omitted when a Presanctified is about to be celebrated. Indeed, the observation is precise. Wherever the most strict and ancient taxis is observed whether in the monasteries—perhaps not in all—or in parish temples—probably in a minimal number, the "Our Father" of the service of the typika is said when a Presanctified is not about to be celebrated but is omitted when its celebration is provided for on this day. The kontakia are then immediately appended at "Forgive, remit...." At first glance, this omission appears unjustifiable or in any case strange. The monastics do not omit anything. It would be inexplicable that they did not say the "Our Father" itself alone without

---

sion of the one trapeza on fasting days.

1463. "Βλέπων ὁ ληστής..."

1464. "Ἐν μέσῳ δύο ληστῶν..."

1465. "Τὸν ἀμνὸν καὶ ποιμένα καί..."

1466. "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν."

1467. "Ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου..."

1468. "Δι' εὐχῶν..."

1469. "Ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς..."

1470. "Χορὸς ὁ ἐπουράνιος..." The full text is, " Χορὸς ὁ ἐπουράνιος ὑμνεῖ σε καὶ λέγει· Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ, πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου."

1471. "Ἄνες, ἄφες..."

a special reason, while they repeat it on many occasions during the course of the services of the daily cycle without this bothering them or the monks contemplating its omission. The reason being put forward is that it will be said in the Presanctified. However, there is a parallel of it with the same rationale. During Great Thursday and Great Saturday, when the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated attached to the Vespers, as well as on the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, when the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated consecutively to the Great Hours and again attached to the Vespers, not only is the "Our Father" omitted from the typika, but also the "I believe...."[1472] From "The heavenly chorus...," they proceed to "Forgive, remit," and from there to the kontakia. The rationale of the omission is the same. It will be said in the Divine Liturgy.

In the liturgical books in the printed Typika, I do not know of any such type of rubric. The omission is done "customarily" and on the basis of unwritten standard guidelines. Only in the very late manuscript Typikon of the monastery of Dionysiou of the Holy Mountain from the year 1909 did I encounter the point above in Great Lent and on the other days that we mentioned. A similar written rubric likely also exists in other monastic Typika. In any case, the monastery of Dionysiou is famous for the strictness of its Typikon.

Here precisely is where the wonder of the matter is found. The service of the typika of our Hōrologion is a very old monastic service, which was devised as a substitute for the Divine Liturgy on days where the celebration of the Divine Liturgy was not possible for varied reasons. It was frequent in deserts and in remote cells, where there were no priests, but a way had to be found for the fathers to commune of the undefiled Mysteries. At that time, they performed the service of the typika and communed from Presanctified Gifts on their own. Accounts of private holy communion of such a type have been preserved, not only in monastic communities or by ascetics, but also by secular faithful. Although the day was not a fasting one,

1472. "Πιστεύω..."

the service of the typika and holy communion took place after the sixth hour (12:00 noon), as also the Divine Liturgy, namely prior to the meal, as it is in the printed Hōrologia. However, if it was a fasting day, the service of the typika and communion took place after a complete abstention from food, namely, after the ninth hour of the day (3:00 p.m.) and prior to supper.

We find this service of the typika for the first time in the most ancient surviving Hōrologion, according to the taxis of the monastery of Saint Sabas, in the *Codex Sinai 863* from the ninth century.[1473] It is nearly in its contemporary form but with the expressive title, "For communion,"[1474] and in addition two small prayers, "for communion"[1475] and "after communion."[1476] The imitation of the Divine Liturgy, both in contemporary form and with the variations of the *Codex Sinai 863*, is evident. According to Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (Dialogue, chapters 329 and 330) "the service of the typika...has the form, in a likeness of the Sacred Liturgy, when it is chanted without a Liturgy."[1477] The two psalms that preceded (102 and 145) stand in place of the antiphons, "Only begotten Son..."[1478] stands in place of the eisodikon (just as in the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos), and the Beatitudes are chanted instead of the gospel reading ("instead of the epistle pericope and that of the divine gospel,"[1479] according to Saint Symeōn). And Saint Symeōn continues: "At that time, they also say what outside is said by all during the sacred-service, what is said among the angels, 'Holy, holy, holy' three times, the confession of faith, also the prayer from the Savior [the 'Our Father'] for all our sins to be forgiven, at the end of which appropriately the troparia for the day, 'Lord have mercy' forty times according to the taxis of the services. And immediately Psalms [33

1473. In question 414, Phountoulēs identifies the title of this Hōrologion as, *Ὡρολόγιον κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς Λαύρας τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς Σάββα* (Hōrologion according to the Rule of the Lavra of Our Holy Father Sabas).

1474. "Εἰς τὴν μετάληψιν." The word "εἰς" here is translated as "for" to denote purpose, but an alternative translation could be "at" in the sense of time.

1475. "εἰς τὴν μετάληψιν."

1476. "μετὰ τὴν μετάληψιν."

1477. PG 155:593d.

1478. "Ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός..."

1479. PG 155:596c.

and 144] are provided for the thanksgiving of all before God and of all in need of nourishment, 'I will bless the Lord'[1480] and 'I will exalt you, my God.'[1481] And after the antidōron is distributed for our sanctification, the dismissal is done" (Dialogue, chapter 330).[1482] Already during this period of Saint Symeōn and long before it, the service of the typika was no longer a service for communion, but the connection to the distribution of antidōron had remained.[1483] Afterwards even this disappeared, but the form of the service of the Divine Liturgy remained, without communion and without the two prayers of communion that we saw in the Sinai codex.

However, the memory remained inextinguishable that Divine Liturgy and typika are identical as to form, even if the essence had been forgotten, namely, the original purpose of the typika; holy communion without a Liturgy and without a priest. For this reason, also when the Divine Liturgy is celebrated, the "Our Father" (and the "I believe") are omitted and when it is not celebrated, they are said. Despite the centuries that have passed and the changes in liturgical customs that have intervened, the liturgical memory and consciousness of the Church continues to subconsciously view the typika as identical to the Divine Liturgy. Consequently, it is good that the Lord's Prayer (and the Symbol of Faith) are not said twice in the same service.

597

In a case where marriage is celebrated by two or more priests, what must the first in rank and what must the others say?

In the manuscript Euchologia as well as in our printed liturgical books, special rubrics do not exist that prescribe what the role is of more than one priest when they participate in the celebration

1480. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον..."

1481. "Ὑψώσω σε, ὁ Θεός μου..."

1482. PG 155:596c–596d.

1483. On Sundays and great feasts, in monasteries, after Liturgy, during the service of the Trapeza, there is a censing followed by each person taking a small piece from a cut section of bread that is brought around to each table. A question could be raised whether this is a similar memory of the distribution of antidōron associated with the service of the typika.

of marriage. All the individual standard rubrics speak concerning a priest and a deacon. "Concelebration" in marriage was obviously not very common, otherwise relevant provisions would exist, just as occurs in the Divine Liturgy. And the diaconal petitions are well known from the practice commonly observed in all the mysteries and services. The deacon does not of course say the gospel reading, which, as we saw in another answer, in all instances, apart only from the Liturgy, is read by the priest.[1484]

During our era, especially in large cities, it appears that the participation of more than one priest in marriage is common. The absence of specific and authentic guidelines becomes very clear for this reason since indeed the same taxis is not observed in parishes of the same cities. The search for what is appropriate to be done must be based on the texts themselves and the importance of individual sacred practices, which, however, is not always obvious during the course of the service and certainly from popular belief concerning it. For example, the crowning and the "dance of Isaiah," according to most people, are the most significant elements of the mystery, which also gave the popular name to the entire rite, without of course being such.[1485] Conversely, the "joining of the hands,"[1486] which constitutes the age-old and central symbol of nuptial union and celebration, passes by almost unobserved. In the prayers, matters are even much more difficult and indiscernible, and for this reason variations are done by others regarding them.

In a case of co-participation of two priests in the benediction, on the one hand it is customary by some for the second in rank to perform the betrothal and on the other hand for the first in rank to celebrate the marriage. According to another more customary allocation, especially when more than two priests participate, the prayers are distributed among all. The second in rank again keeps the bestowal of the rings and the first in rank crowns the newlyweds. As for the prayers, for the allocation to be done in the correct manner, it must be known that the main prayer of the marriage is

1484. See question 594.
1485. See questions 577 and 581.
1486. "ἅρμοση τῶν χειρῶν."

the third one, the brief and most ancient prayer, "Holy God, who fashioned humanity from dust...,"[1487] during which the joining of the newlyweds' hands is done, when the phrase is said, "and do you yourself now, O Master, stretch forth your hand from your holy dwelling place and join together your servant and your servant, for by you a woman is joined to a man."[1488] This prayer is equivalent to the prayer of the anaphora of the Divine Liturgy and the consecratory prayers of other mysteries, and the phrase above is equivalent to the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Divine Liturgy and in the rest of the mysteries.

According to the taxis of the services of the mysteries and the other sacred rites of our liturgical form, there are always two constitutive prayers: one the consecratory and one a second that usually follows the blessing ("Peace be to all"[1489] — "Let us bow our heads to the Lord"[1490]), namely, the prayer of inclination, which refers to the expected fruits of the mystery. Here in marriage, this is the fourth prayer ("O Lord our God, who in your saving economy..."),[1491] also itself just as brief, succinct, and ancient as the third. The others are later and regional, which were added after the detachment of the benediction of marriage from the Divine Liturgy in order for the otherwise brief service to acquire some substance. However, some who are impressed by the length of the first two later prayers ("O God, the undefiled one...,"[1492] "Blessed are you O Lord..."[1493]), the pompous popular style, the many names, and the equally many prayers and blessings, place the emphasis on them and leave the two principal prayers to the priests second and third in rank, while the first in rank recite the two secondary ones first.

1487. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ πλάσας ἐκ χοὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον..."

1488. "αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἐξαπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου καὶ ἅρμοσον τὸν δοῦλόν σου καὶ τὴν δούλην σου... ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται ἀνδρὶ γυνή." Translation modified from N.M. Vaporis, ed., and John von Holzhausen and Michael Gelsinger, trans., *An Orthodox Prayer Book* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977), 87.

1489. "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι."

1490. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."

1491. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τῇ σωτηριώδει σου οἰκονομίᾳ..."

1492. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἄχραντος..."

1493. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε..."

Something equivalent also happens in the service of betrothal. The long later prayer ("O Lord our God, who accompanied…"),[1494] similar in style and in manner of composition to the first two prayers of marriage, is not a main consecratory prayer but rather the brief and ancient one, which also is the one constitutive of the benediction of the betrothal ("O God eternal…bless also these your servants…").[1495]

All the other elements can and must be accordingly distributed to the participating priests. However, the main prayers indisputably belong to the first in rank, who also is the celebrant of the mystery. He will read the prayer, "Holy God…" and, according to age-old and even pre-Christian tradition and taxis, will do the joining of hands, namely, the establishment of the mystery of marriage.[1496] It is well known that the Old Testament also itself speaks regarding a joining of hands during the nuptial rite (Tobit 7:12, Raguel "called Sarra his daughter and taking her hand, he gave her over to Tobias as wife, and he said, 'Behold according to the law of Moses take her…' and he blessed them").[1497] Fathers and ecclesiastical writers speak with emphasis regarding the joining of the newlyweds' hands, as the preeminent nuptial symbolism and as a practice synonymous to the celebration of marriage. For example, Synesios of Ptolemais, *Letter 105*: "to me…God, the law, and the sacred hand of Theophilos [the Patriarch of Alexandria] had given a wife,"[1498] Grēgorios the Theologian, *Letter 193 to Prokopios*, "I give the right hands of the young [the newlyweds] to one another and both with God's,"[1499] Symeōn of

1494. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ παιδὶ τοῦ Πατριάρχου…"

1495. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος… εὐλόγησον καὶ τοὺς δούλους σου τούτους…"

1496. See question 18.

1497. Translation from NETS. In the text, the passage from Tobit is cited as 10:12 and the name "Ραμουήλ" is used instead of "Ραγουήλ." These points are corrected in the translation.

1498. Synesios of Cyrene, *Letter 105* in *Synésios de Cyrène, Correspondence, Lettres LXIV–CLVI*, ed. Antonio Garzya and trad. Denis Roques, Oeuvres, Tome III (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000), 238. Synesios of Cyrene (c. 370 – c. 413) was a bishop of Ptolemais (located in modern Libya) and an important philosopher and theologian.

1499. Grēgorios the Theologian, *Letter 193* in *Gregor von Nazianzen, Briefe*, ed. Paul Gallay, Die Griechischen Christilichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahr-

Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 279, "the priest says the first prayer of marriage while invoking God the one holy…for Him to extend his hand from above and to join[1500] them to one another. And again, he joins[1501] their hands, signifying the perfection of the union."[1502] Analogous are the standard rubrics of the manuscripts, which with emphasis stress the importance, symbolism, and the theological meaning of the joining of the newlyweds' hands during the reading of the pertinent phrase of the prayer: "and holding their right hands [the priest] gives them to one another,"[1503] or "he gives their right hands to one another and says, 'for by you a woman is joined…,"[1504] or "entwining the right hands of one another,"[1505] "entwining the right hands of one another together"[1506] or, more properly,[1507] "and he entwines their small right fingers"[1508] (which is preserved up until nowadays in some places). We conclude with the lovely rendering in colloquial language of the above rubric, which is encountered in the *Codex National Library of Greece 696* from the fifteenth century: "And you take the right hand of the bride and give it to the right hand of the groom. 'For by you a woman is joined…'."[1509]

---

hunderte (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969), 140. Compare the translation in Bradley K. Storin, trans., *Gregory of Nazianzus's Letter Collection: The Complete Translation* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 151.

1500. "ἁρμόσαι."

1501. "συνάπτει."

1502. PG 155:509c.

1503. "καὶ κρατήσας [ὁ ἱερεύς] αὐτῶν τὰς δεξιὰς χεῖρας, παραδίδωσιν ἀλλήλοις."

1504. "παραδίδει ἀλλήλοις τὰς δεξιὰς αὐτῶν χεῖρας καὶ λέγει· 'Ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται…'"

1505. "πλέξας αὐτῶν τὰς δεξιὰς χεῖρας."

1506. "συμπλέξας ἀλλήλων τὰς δεξιάς."

1507. The word, "κόσμιος," has the sense of decency. There is an implication that the holding of hands publicly was somehow considered inappropriate in certain areas.

1508. "συμπλέκει αὐτῶν τοῖς δεξιοῖς ἄκροις δακτύλοις."

1509. "Καὶ παίρνεις τὸ δεξιὸ χέρι τῆς νύμφης καὶ δίνεις τὸ εἰ[ς] τοῦ γαμβροῦ τὸ δεξιὸ χέρι. 'Ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἁρμόζεται…'" While the text of Phountoulēs has εἰ, it seems incorrect and that the [ς] is necessary.

598

Why do the last days of the month of April not have a theotokion and staurotheotokion in the stichēra of Vespers and in the kathisma of the third ode in Matins, and how is this deficiency made up for?

There indeed does not exist a theotokion or staurotheotokion in the last eight days of the Mēnaion for April (23–30) in the services of Vespers and Matins at the points that are highlighted by the question, but after the group of the hesperia[1510] it is stereotypically noted, "Glory both now. Of the feast"[1511] (on the twenty-third on the commemoration of Saint Geōrgios, it is noted "Glory"[1512] of the saint, "Both now. Of the occurring feast,"[1513] similarly on the twenty-fifth of the evangelist Mark, "Glory" of the saint, "Both now. Of the feast"[1514]), but "And of the feast"[1515] is always repeated after the kathisma following the third ode. In both these cases, it is self-evident that this is about the feast of Pascha, which according to its latest date—obviously according to the Julian Calendar—extends up until April 25. Consequently, the days noted above always fall in the Paschal period or even in Renewal Week. The Mēnaia presuppose the calculation of Pascha according to the Julian (the so-called "Old") Calendar.

Conversely, according to the Gregorian (the so-called "New") Calendar, given that the date of Pascha after the calendar reform remained calculated consistent with the Julian, when Pascha is celebrated during the first days of May, and specifically during the seven-day period from May 2–8, the last days of April 23–29 accordingly fall in Great Week or in the week prior to Palm Sunday, the Sixth week of the Fast. This is not very common, but also not rare. Specifically during the twenty-first century, from 2001

1510. "Τὰ ἑσπέρια" are the troparia that follow "Lord I have cried to you..." ("Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ...") during Vespers.

1511. "Δόξα καὶ νῦν. Τῆς ἑορτῆς."

1512. "Δόξα."

1513. "Καὶ νῦν. Τῆς τυχούσης ἑορτῆς."

1514. "Καὶ νῦν. Τῆς ἑορτῆς."

1515. "Καὶ τῆς ἑορτῆς."

up until 2100 in the year of our Lord, Pascha falls fifteen times in the time range as above, namely, on May 8 in 2078, May 7 in 2051, May 6 in 2040, May 5 in 2002, 2013, 2024, and 2097, May 4 in 2059, 2070, and 2081, May 3 in 2043 and 2054, and May 2 during the years of our Lord 2021, 2027, and 2032, if, obviously, the assumptions for the calendar in force nowadays remain unchanged until the end of the century.

We precisely have the reverse phenomenon during the month of May. Thus, when Pascha is very early—it extends up until March 22 according to the Julian Calendar—then the period of fasting for the Holy Apostles also arrives as early as May 18.[1516] Then, required for days from that date up until the end of the month, according to the rubrics of the Typikon, are also whatever is required for Great Lent and for all the non-feast days of the liturgical year, namely, a theotokion or a staurotheotokion at the stichēra of Vespers and similarly a theotokion or a staurotheotokion for the mesōdion kathisma of the third ode. However, the Mēnaion of May follows the most common case (according to which the end of the month of May falls in the Paschal period) and notes "Glory both now. Of the feast" or "And of the feast" instead of the Theotokia and staurotheotokia above, just as also in the analogous cases for the days of April that we saw. In order to remedy the matter, a selection of theotokia and staurotheotokia of the identical tones has been done, which are published at the end of the Mēnaion of May in an appendix.[1517] But at the end of the service of May 17 of the printed Mēnaion, the illuminating note below is inserted: "Since, when Pascha occurs very early, while the Pentēkostarion comes to an end on the seventeenth of the present month of May, the fast of the Holy Apostles begins from the eighteenth of the same month, in which, after the prosomoia of the daily saint in Vespers, theotokia and staurotheotokia, similar to those,[1518] are required,

1516. In other words, the fasting for the Holy Apostles begins on the earlier date of May 18.

1517. The following phrase is repeated at this point and appears to be a typographical error, "Στὸ τέλος τοῦ Μηναίου τοῦ Μαΐου, σέ παράρτημα" (At the end of the Mēnaion of May, in an appendix). This phrase has been omitted for clarity.

1518. Namely, the prosomoia.

for this reason such theotokia and staurotheotokia have been placed from manuscripts, at the end of the present month; likewise also others, after the kathisma of the third ode, so that everyone might have everything handy, when the need requires them."

Certainly, the note above and the provision of the appendix's troparia are useless for those monasteries or parishes that follow the New Calendar. However, the rubric as above and the relevant appendix are well repeated in new printed editions for those who follow the Old Calendar. However, by analogy and according to their model, it would be useful, or rather necessitated, in new printed editions of the Mēnaion for the month of April that a similar appendix be attached with theotokia and staurotheotokia of the stichēra of Vespers and the mesōdia kathismata from April 23–29 for even those few instances of the early Pascha according to the Gregorian Calendar. These troparia could be gathered with ease from the Paraklētikē or from the Mēnaia, where there exist a multitude of these theotokia and staurotheotokia in an identical tone and similar form[1519] to the stichēra and for the kathismata of these days. At the time of chanting, the search for the appropriate theotokia is almost impossible, and "look" (ὅρα) and "see" (βλέπε) or "look for" (ζήτει), with which sometimes similar difficulties and shortcomings in services are dealt with, oftentimes probably produce confusion rather than facilitation.[1520]

In any case, until the solution is provided by new printed editions of the Mēnaia, it would be good for the required troparia to be obtained in advance from the same Mēnaion of April, lest other liturgical books are used, and the difficulty is worsened. With this in mind, the following could be chosen:[1521]

1519. Namely, this infers the notion of a prosomoion (προσόμοιον).

1520. Phountoulēs is noting his observation of unprepared chanters searching for troparia when these hymns are not explicit in the Mēnaia.

1521. Due to their complex nature, the individual paragraphs that follow are presented in tables based on the text.

23 Ἀπριλίου, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἡ μνήμη τοῦ ἁγίου Γεωργίου μετατίθεται μετὰ τὸ Πάσχα.	**April 23, in the event that the commemoration of Saint Geōrgios is transferred after Pascha.**
Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος δ᾽, *"Ὡς γενναῖον ἐν μάρτυσι"*	Theotokion, Tone Four, *"As noble among martyrs"*
"Τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν ἀμόλυντον..."	"Let us splendidly bless the undefiled tabernacle..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Τὸν ἀμνὸν καὶ ποιμένα σε..." (5 Ἀπριλίου)	"As she saw you the lamb and shepherd on the tree..." (April 5)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον ἀπὸ γ᾽, Ἦχος πλ. δ᾽, *"Τὴν Σοφίαν καὶ Λόγον..."*	Kathisma Theotokion from the third ode, Plagal of the Fourth Tone, *"Conceiving the wisdom and word in your womb..."*
"Εἰς ἰλὺν ἐνεπάγην ἁμαρτιῶν..."	"I am stuck in the mud of sins..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Τὸν ἀμνὸν καὶ ποιμένα καὶ λυτρωτήν..." (1 Ἀπριλίου)	"The ewe-lamb beholding the lamb and shepherd and redeemer..." (April 1)

24 Ἀπριλίου	**April 24**
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος πλ. δ᾽, *"Οἱ μάρτυρές σου, Κύριε..."*	Stichēron Theotokion, Plagal of the Fourth Tone, *"Your martyrs, O Lord..."*
"Ἁγνὴ θεογεννήτρια..."	"Pure Mother of God..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Σταυρῷ σε καθηλούμενον..." (9 Ἀπριλίου)	"She who bore you beheld you nailed to the Cross..." (April 9)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος γ᾽, *"Θείας πίστεως..."*	Kathisma Theotokion. Third Tone, *"The Confession of divine faith..."*
"Θείας φύσεως, οὐκ ἐχωρίσθη..." (6 Ἀπριλίου)	"God was not separated from divine nature..." (April 6)
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Θείας φύσεως, οὐ διῃρέθης..." (6 Ἀπριλίου)	"You were not divided from divine nature..." (April 6)

25 Ἀπριλίου, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἡ μνήμη τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Μάρκου μετατίθεται μετὰ τὸ Πάσχα.	**April 25, in the event that the commemoration of the evangelist Markos is transferred after Pascha.**
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος α΄, *"Τῶν οὐρανίων ταγμάτων τὸ ἀγαλλίαμα..."*	Stichēron Theotokion, First Tone, *"The joy of the heavenly orders..."*
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ θεωροῦσα ἡ ἀπειρόγαμος..." (19 Ἀπριλίου)	"The unwed and unblemished Virgin who beheld on the Cross..." (April 19)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος α΄, *"Τὸν τάφον σου, Σωτήρ..."*	Kathisma Theotokion, First Tone, *"Soldiers watching over your tomb, O Savior..."*
"Ἐγγίζει ὁ κριτής..."	"The judge approaches..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Ὡς εἶδεν ἐν Σταυρῷ, ἡ Ἀμνάς σε τὸν Ἄρνα..." (8 Ἀπριλίου)	"As the ewe-lamb saw you the lamb on the Cross..." (April 8)

26 Ἀπριλίου	**April 26**
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος δ΄, *"Ὡς γενναῖον ἐν μάρτυσιν..."*	Stichēron Theotokion, Fourth Tone, *"As noble among martyrs..."*
"Ὡς Θεοῦ μήτηρ ἄφθορος..."	"As the chaste mother of God..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Πικροτάτως δακρύουσαν..." (8 Ἀπριλίου)	"Weeping most bitterly..." (April 8)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος γ΄, *"Θείας πίστεως..."*	Kathisma Theotokion, Third Tone, *"The Confession of divine faith..."*
"Παραμύθιον, τῶν θλιβομένων..."	"Comfort of the afflicted..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Σταυρουμένου σου, ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη..." (11 Ἀπριλίου)	"When you were crucified, the earth shook..." (April 11)

27 Ἀπριλίου	April 27
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος δ', *"Ὡς γενναῖον ἐν μάρτυσιν..."*	Stichēron Theotokion, Fourth Tone, *"As noble among martyrs..."*
"Ὡς πηγὴν ἁγιάσματος..."	"As a fount of sanctification..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Ὡς ἀμνόν σε ἑλκόμενον..." (10 Ἀπριλίου)	"As a lamb who is drawn..." (April 10)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος δ', *"Ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἑκουσίως..."*	Kathisma Theotokion, Fourth Tone, *"May He who voluntarily was raised on the Cross..."*
"Τῶν δωρεῶν σου τῶν σεπτῶν ἀπολαύοντες..."	"When enjoying your sacred gifts..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Οὐ φέρω βλέπειν σε Σταυρῷ τεταμένον..." (5 Ἀπριλίου)	"I cannot bear to see you stretched on the Cross..." (April 5)

28 Ἀπριλίου	April 28
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος πλ. δ', *"Ὦ τοῦ παραδόξου θαύματος..."*	Stichēron Theotokion, Plagal of the Fourth Tone, *"O marvelous wonder..."*
"Ποίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς θεάσωμαι..."	"With what eyes do we behold..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Ἥλιος ἰδών σε ἔφριξεν..." (2 Ἀπριλίου)	"The sun seeing you shuddered..." (April 2)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον, Ἦχος πλ. δ', *"Τὴν Σοφίαν καὶ Λόγον..."*	Kathisma Theotokion. Third Tone, *"Conceiving the wisdom and word in your womb..."*
"Πειρασμοῖς πολυπλόκοις περιπεσών..."	"Falling in with much-tangled temptations..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Τὸν ἀμνὸν καὶ ποιμένα καὶ λυρωτήν..." (7 Ἀπριλίου, ἀπὸ τὴν ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Γεωργίου Μυτιλήνης)	"The ewe-lamb viewing the lamb and shepherd and redeemer..." (April 7, from the service of Saint Geōrgios of Mytilene)

29 Ἀπριλίου	April 29
Στιχηρὸν Θεοτοκίον στὸν ἑσπερινό, Ἦχος α', *"Πανεύφημοι μάρτυρες..."*	Stichēron Theotokion in Vespers, First Tone, *"Wholly blessed martyrs..."*
"Μαρία τὸ ἄμωμον καὶ νοῦν..."	"Mary, the unblemished vehicle, who also surpasses every mind by purity..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Τὸν ἴδιον Ἄρνα ἡ ἀμνάς..." (7 Ἀπριλίου, πάλι ἀπὸ τὴν ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Γεωργίου Μυτιλήνης)	"Her own lamb, the ewe-lamb..." (April 7, again from the service of Saint Geōrgios of Mytilene)
Κάθισμα Θεοτοκίον ἀπὸ γ' ὠδῆς, Ἦχος α', *"Τὸν τάφον σου Σωτήρ..."*	Kathisma Theotokion from the third ode, First Tone, *"Soldiers watching over your tomb, O Savior..."*
"Συγχάρητε βροτοί..."	"Rejoice mortals..."
Σταυροθεοτοκίον	Staurotheotokion
"Ὦ θαύματος καινοῦ..." (9 Ἀπριλίου)	"O new wonder..." (April 9)

Finally, April 30 will not have need of theotokia and staurotheotokia when Pascha will fall on a more extreme date during the year 2078, May 8. It will coincide with the Saturday of Lazarus.

599

During the Presanctifieds of Wednesday and Thursday (of the Great Canon) of the Fifth Week of the Fast, what kathisma of the Psalter is read; the Seventh and the Twelfth respectively according to the tables for the stichologia, or the Eighteenth according to the modern Typika, and why?

As is well known, the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is celebrated on all the days of Great Lent except Saturday and Sunday and the feast of the Annunciation, according to the fifty-second canon of the Penthektē Ecumenical Council in Trullo ("on all the fasting days of Holy Lent, except for Saturday, Sunday and the holy day of the Annunciation").[1522] But it is regularly celebrated on Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent, the Thursday of the Great Canon, the first three days of Great Week, and when a commemoration of a celebrated saint

1522. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:427.

falls during fasting days. In all the instances above of its regular or exceptional celebration, the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts always is, and without any exception, connected with Vespers. The reason is obvious. During the days of fasting for Great Lent, abstinence from food is complete up until also Vespers, and holy communion of the Presanctified Gifts comes as the culmination of the entire day's spiritual struggle of the believer. This Vespers, to which the Presanctified is attached, is the daily Vespers for the days of the holy fast with small modifications: an enarxis with "Blessed is the Kingdom"[1523] instead of "Blessed is our God,"[1524] synaptes between the staseis of the kathisma of the Psalter, an idiomelon as a first stichēron in the psalms of Lamp-lighting, entrance, and "Command. The Light of Christ."[1525] After the reading of the Proverb (or of Job during Great Week), the Presanctified Liturgy is attached. The elements prior to the reading from Proverbs are those of the common Vespers: Introductory Psalm, litany of peace, kathisma of the Psalter, psalms of Lamp-lighting with their stichēra, "O Gladsome Light,"[1526] and the two readings (Genesis–Proverbs, or Exodus–Job during Great Week). As a kathisma of the Psalter, the eighteenth is provided, the odes of the anabathmoi (Psalms 119–133), which according to liturgical terminology are called the "To the Lord,"[1527] (or "τὰ προσκύρια" according to certain manuscripts) from the beginning phrase of the first one, Psalm 119 ("To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted..."). [1528] This kathisma is not peculiar to the Presanctified, but it is the kathisma which is provided from the tables of stichologia of the Psalter for all the Vespers of the weekdays of Great Lent, namely, from Monday up until also Friday. The first kathisma ("Blessed is the man")[1529] is read during Saturday Vespers throughout the year, while a reading of a kathisma is never provided for the Sunday Vespers. From older sources, we know that this taxis, which is nowadays

1523. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."
1524. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν..."
1525. "Κέλευσον. Φῶς Χριστοῦ."
1526. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν..."
1527. "τὰ Πρὸς Κύριον."
1528. "Πρὸς Κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐκέκραξα..."
1529. "Μακάριος ἀνήρ..."

in force for Great Lent, was in force for the whole year. Namely, the eighteenth kathisma originally was the invariable kathisma for Vespers, except for Saturday and Sunday. This taxis was preserved during the conservative period of Great Lent, during which the Psalter is cycled twice during the week, just as also during the first three days of Great Week, during which the Psalter is cycled once. During the remaining days of the year, the stichologia of the Psalter is regulated by the relevant tables, which are published together with the Psalter or with the Typika and basically, without exceptions or mistakes, follow the taxis that is prescribed by the Jerusalemite Typikon of the monastery of Saint Sabas.

We do not insist on this point because it does not have an immediate connection to our subject. It suffices for us that the odes of the anabathmoi are the kathisma[1530] provided for Vespers for a great period of the liturgical year and certainly during Great Week on the days on which a Presanctified is regularly celebrated or can be celebrated (Monday up until Friday). Thus, Saint Theodōros the Stoudite, or whoever is the author of the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*[1531] that bears his name, notes when commenting on the individual elements that constitute the whole service: "And when the reader who readily [after the exclamation and litany of peace] begins the canon of the anabathmoi...And immediately at every single antiphon of the anabathmoi, he [obviously the priest] exclaims a small petition."[1532] Conversely, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, when commenting on the Liturgy of the Presanctified (*Dialogue*, chapters 353–355) makes no mention regarding the anabathmoi, namely, the eighteenth kathisma, precisely because the Vespers, with which he presents it as being connected, is not the monastic one, but the "asmatic"/parish one, which did not have a kathisma of the Psalter, nor consequently also the eighteenth. I think it became clear that the "To the Lord" are not an element of the Presanctified, but of Vespers, and the rubrics that are related to these

1530. As discussed above, Phountoulēs is referring to a kathisma of the Psalter, the eighteenth, the odes of the anabathmoi (Psalms 119–133).

1531. "Ἑρμηνείας τῆς θείας λειτουργίας τῶν Προηγιασμένων."

1532. PG 99:1688c.

elements, mention them as an element of the vesperal synaxis, such as "Lord, I have cried to you"[1533] and "O Gladsome Light." The same thing also applies regarding the *Explanation* that bears the name of Theodōros the Stoudite.

However, the continuous connection of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts with the days that have anabathmoi of the Psalter in their Vespers (Wednesday and Friday of Great Lent and the first three days of Great Week), and its celebration for several centuries now in connection with the monastic Vespers and not with the "asmatic" one, created the mistaken impression that the eighteenth kathisma in some manner "belongs" to the Presanctified, just as also "Let my prayer be set forth"[1534] and similar elements. This impression was accentuated by parish practice, during which (even if it is not said) a Psalter is not recited with stichologia except only during the Presanctifieds and during the Saturday Vespers.

This impression also sought a theoretical "justification," and this was found in the supposed penitential character of the odes of the anabathmoi, which blends in with that of the Presanctified. By coincidence, one of the first words of the first psalm of this kathisma assisted in what was sought: "when I was being afflicted"[1535] ("To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted...," Psalm 119:1. Compare also "Woe is me, that my place of sojourn was put at a distance,"[1536] Psalm 119:5). The fact that the stichologia of the same kathisma is also provided for in the Presanctified Liturgy of the Jerusalemite Typikon, which bears the name of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God, does not mean that this kathisma has some particular relation with this Presanctified, but that, just as also in the Byzantine Presanctified, the "To the Lord" are the kathisma of Vespers according to the Jerusalemite Typikon of Saint Sabas.

This misunderstanding would not have had special significance and any practical merit if it did not influence the Church's taxis during the Fifth Week of the Fast. During this week, due to the

---

1533. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ..."
1534. "Κατευθυνθήτω..." See also question 344.
1535. "ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με."
1536. "Οἴμοι! ὅτι ἡ παροικία μου ἐμακρύνθη." Translation taken from NETS.

chanting of the Great Canon during Thursday Matins (in parishes, as is well known, it is transferred for pastoral reasons to Wednesday Compline) and the exceptional length that the service of that Matins takes on, only one kathisma (the eighth) is recited with stichologia during it instead of the three (fifth, seventh, and eighth) that are provided for on the same day during other weeks of the Fast. For the same reason, the stichologia of a kathisma is omitted in the First Hour, which is chanted attached to Matins and which should be the ninth kathisma. However, this causes a relative redistribution in the sequence of stichologia of the kathismata, and the stichologia of the eighteenth kathisma (of the "To the Lord") is not provided for in the Vespers-Presanctified for the Thursday of the Great Canon, but rather that of the twelfth kathisma ("Incline your ear, O Lord, and hear us...,"[1537] Psalms 85–90). And not only this, but also for the Vespers-Presanctified of Wednesday, the eighteenth kathisma is not provided for, just as in all the Vespers after the Presanctified of Wednesday of other weeks of Lent, but the seventh ("All the nations clap your hands...,"[1538] Psalms 46–54). Similar changes also happen on other days of this week (Monday and Tuesday), but do not become noticeable because the Presanctified is not customarily celebrated. However, if a commemoration of a celebrated saint falls on them or if the celebration of a Presanctified is possibly provided for by the taxis of the monastery, the eighteenth kathisma would not be read, but the tenth ("In you, O Lord, I have hoped...,"[1539] Psalms 70–76) and the fourteenth ("Praise the name of the Lord...,"[1540] Psalms 134–142) respectively.

However, some modern Typika provide for the stichologia of the eighteenth kathisma, the "To the Lord," also during those days of the Fifth Week of the Fast, which for these days the strict formal tradition prescribes otherwise for the reasons above. This is done either out of a tendency for simplification, or out of a deficient knowledge of the pertinent rubrics, or even out of a mistaken im-

1537. "Κλῖνον, Κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου, καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν..."
1538. "Πάντα τὰ ἔθνη κροτήσατε χεῖρας..."
1539. "Ἐπὶ σοί, Κύριε, ἤλπισα..."
1540. "Αἰνεῖτε τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου..."

pression that the "To the Lord" is an element that is peculiar to the Presanctified and organically in some manner belongs to it. The fact that in many parishes it is customary for the Great Canon not to be chanted connected with Thursday Matins, as the formal taxis and Triōdion provide for, but with Wednesday Compline, does not constitute a sufficient reason for the disruption of the applicable stichologia provided for by the Typikon of Saint Sabas. Moreover, it is an open secret that in parish temples the stichologia of the five to eight kathismata of the Psalter, which are provided for by the current Typikon for the weekdays of Great Lent, is suspended. However, in the special instances above of the Vesperal-Presanctifieds of the Fifth Week of the Fast, contemporary venerable and very strict monastic Typika agree: "We recite with stichologia the sequential kathisma of the Psalter." And lest any doubt exists, sometimes they add: "And not the 'To the Lord.'"

Pedantry? No, strictness.

600

What does the phrase mean, "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου, πάντοτε..." (Blessed is the entrance of your holy ones/holies always...)[1541] which is said by the priest during the small entrance?

The explanation of this phrase, which is otherwise so short and simple, presents many difficulties because it is not clear what both its parts are referring to: what is the entrance, where is it blessed, and who or what are the holy ones (οἱ ἅγιοι) or holies (τὰ ἅγια), regarding whom or concerning which mention is made in its second part?

1541. "τῶν ἁγίων," can be the genitive plural for the nouns "οἱ ἅγιοι" or "αἱ ἅγιαι" (a masculine or feminine gender plural, which among other meanings can be translated as 'holy ones,' 'saints,' and so forth, when referring to persons) or "τὰ ἅγια" (a neuter gender plural, which can be translated as 'holies,' 'holy elements,' and so forth, when referring to objects). The question assumes this ambiguity of meaning in Greek. The translation in English is provided with "saints/holies" to reflect this ambiguity.

Apart from the prevalent form that is noted in the question, different variations are encountered in the manuscripts that perhaps can facilitate our inquiry:

"Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου..." (Blessed is the entrance of your holy ones/holies...), the most customary variation, or the rarer: "Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἁγία εἴσοδος τῆς θείας λειτουργίας τῶν ἁγίων σου, Κύριε, πάντοτε..." (Blessed is the holy entrance of the Divine Liturgy of your holy ones/holies, O Lord, always...). In this second form, the differentiation is obviously sought from the blessing of the entrance during Vespers or even the similar blessing that is encountered in codices of the fourteenth–fifteenth century, of *Athens 2724*,[1542] in the service of the Small Hagiasmos: "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος διὰ τῆς τεκούσης σε Θεοτόκου, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, πάντοτε..." (Blessed is the entrance through the Theotokos who bore you, O Christ our God, always...). In the intermediate form, "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου, Κύριε..." (Blessed is the entrance of your holy ones/holies, O Lord...), we also encounter it in the service of the "asmatic" Trithektē, while in another variation it is encountered at the beginning of the litanies or in the processional transition from the nave "to the side"[1543] for the celebration of the Lamp-lighting according to the testimony of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki: "Εὐλογημένη ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ, πάντοτε..." (Blessed is the glory of the Lord from his holy place, always...) (*Dialogue*, chapter 352).[1544] In all these instances, the phrase is accompanied with a blessing by the hand of the priest, and it is introduced with the diaconal command, "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα, τὴν ἁγίαν εἴσοδον" (Bless, master, the holy entrance). Only in a few codices is the diaconal ex-

1542. A misprint in the text reads "272Y."

1543. "ἐν τῇ πλαγίᾳ," PG 155:653d. Namely, the side of the temple as the phrase from the commentary of Saint Symeōn reads, "Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ πλαγίᾳ ψάλλεται τοῦ ναοῦ ὡς παράκλησις ὁ ἑσπερινὸς παρὰ τῶν ψαλτῶν." For studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

1544. PG 155:653d.

hortation in the Divine Liturgy differentiated: "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα, τὴν μικρὰν εἴσοδον" (Bless, master, the small entrance).

Finally, it is useful to note that this blessing of the entrance and the phrase that accompanies it do not belong to the original text of the Divine Liturgy. It must have been introduced during the end of the twelfth century because it is not attested to by the most ancient sources and by the ancient manuscripts.

In all the instances above (small entrance of the Divine Liturgy, Vespers, and Trithektē), the priest is found at the head of a procession[1545] which turns towards the holy bēma and stands in the middle of the temple, "ἐν τῷ μεσονάῳ" or in the usual place, "ἐν τῷ συνήθει τόπῳ," looking towards the East. According to the *Diataxis* of Patriarch Philotheos, the deacon when saying "Bless, master, the holy entrance," "at the same time also points in this manner towards the East with the orarion, as he holds it," and the priest then blessed "making a cross facing East."[1546]

The priest is called upon to bless "τὴν ἁγίαν εἴσοδον" (the holy entrance) and blesses "τὴν εἴσοδον" (the entrance). The word has two possible interpretations. "Entrance" (εἴσοδος) can also be the gate (ἡ πύλη) of the holy bēma, which is found precisely in front of the priest, towards which the deacon points with the orarion and from which within a short time a deacon, priest, and any concelebrants will enter the holy bēma. This gate is properly characterized by the deacon as "holy" (ἁγία)—a holy entrance of the sacred bēma. Therefore, in the case of the coming entrance, it is opportunely blessed, just as the upper throne (ἄνω καθέδρα) is blessed afterwards in a short time. The blessing of the entrance is obviously based on a most archaic act of similar behavior, the echo of which we find in the New Testament in the Lord's injunctions to his apostles: "Into whatever house you enter, first say, 'Peace to this house'" (Luke 10:5), or even in liturgical texts such as in the last prayer of marriage, "O God, our God…bless their entrances and departures."[1547] In the parallel of the

1545. "μιᾶς λιτανευτικῆς πομπῆς."

1546. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6.

1547. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν… εὐλόγησον αὐτῶν εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους." In other liturgical uses, the "entrances and departures" refer to entrances into life

blessing of the entrance in the service of Hagiasmos, which we mentioned above, it is without doubt that this is the case of a blessing of an entrance of a temple of the Mother of God, perhaps of the Panagia of Blachernai, from which this service probably derives its origin ("...through the Theotokos who bore you").[1548]

However, in the case of the blessing of the entrance of Vespers, the Divine Liturgy, or the Trithektē, it is equally, but not more, possible that the gate/beautiful gate of the sanctuary (ἡ πύλη/ἡ ὡραία πύλη τοῦ ἱεροῦ) is not meant, but the act itself of entering, the procession entering the holy bēma. The acceptance or rejection of this second interpretation depends on which meaning would be given to the continuation of the phrase, "τῶν ἁγίων σου." And here the possibility of two interpretations exists. It can be understood as neuter ("τὰ ἅγια τοῦ Θεοῦ"), namely, His holy temple, the holy of holies of His temple, the sanctuary, as if the earthly dwelling of God. With this meaning, "τὰ ἅγια" is not only encountered many times in the Old Testament (compare Psalms 21:3, 59:6, 62:2), but also in the New Testament (Hebrews 8:2; 9:1–25; 13:11) and particularly in Hebrews 10:19–20 ("having confidence...for the entrance of the holies by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, namely, his flesh"),[1549] which is encountered verbatim as a quotation in the prayer of the curtain of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos.[1550] It is obvious that the blessing phrase, "[Εὐλογημένη] ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων [σου]," is inspired by this passage.

---

through birth and departures by death, such as in the third prayer from the Vespers for Pentecost, "Σοὶ χάριν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὁμολογοῦμεν, ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰσόδοις ἡμῶν ταῖς εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον, καὶ ταῖς ἐξόδοις, αἳ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἡμῶν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς ἀκηράτου ζωῆς, διὰ τῆς σῆς ἀψευδοῦς ἐπαγγελίας προμνηστεύονται" (We confess your grace for all things, for our entrances into this world, and departures, which obtain our hope of resurrection and unfading life through your certain promise). The "entrances and departures" (εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους) most likely refer to the entrance of the betrothed into their new life as spouses and their future departure from the marital union through death.

1548. "...διὰ τῆς τεκούσης σε Θεοτόκου."

1549. "ἔχοντες ...παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦτ' ἔστι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ." RSV (modified).

1550. This refers to the prayer for being deemed worthy "to enter into the place of the tabernacle of God's glory, to be behind the curtain and observe

However, if according to the other possible interpretation, the general "τῶν ἁγίων" was taken as the masculine gender "ἅγιοι," now the entering clergy or accompanying angels must be meant, according to the words of the prayer of the entrance of the Liturgy that had been read a short time before. In fact, in the past, when this prayer of the entrance was said outside the royal gate of the temple, and after it clergy and people entered into the nave for the performance of the Divine Liturgy, as is done nowadays during the service of the dedication,[1551] the "τῶν ἁγίων" could literally be the holy people of God, his holy Church, certainly according to the characteristic phrase of the prayer of the entrance: "Εὐεργέτα καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πάσης δημιουργέ, πρόσδεξαι προσιοῦσαν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν" (Benefactor and creator of all creation, favorably receive the approaching Church), which is encountered in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos according to the *Codex Barberini 336* and in a variation as a prayer of entrance in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos.[1552]

Similar and parallel with the present interpretative difficulty is the prayer of the trisagion, "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος…" (O Holy God, who is resting among the holies/holy ones…) and the exclamation, "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις ἐπαναπαύει…" (For you our God are holy and rests upon the holies/holy ones) (or

---

the holy of holies" (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τόπον σκηνώματος δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἕως τε γενέσθαι τοῦ καταπετάσματος καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων κατοπτεῦσαι). For a discussion, see questions 51–52 as well as the introduction and text of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos in Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1985), 79–80, 116–117. For the critical edition of the text, see B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 80. In addition, most recently, see Ἀλκιβιάδης Κ. Καζαμίας, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Θεοβαδίστου Ὄρους Σινᾶ, Ἁγία Αἰκατερίνη, 2006), where there is a prologue by Phountoulēs and a critical review of prior editions.

1551. Namely, the consecration of temples.

1552. Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 24.1; B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 162.

"κατοικεῖς καὶ ἐπαναπαύει," "you dwell and rest"[1553] of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos). The possibility of interpretation here is twofold: The "ἅγια," in which God dwells and rests upon could be his temple or heaven. But could also be his holy people, the "ἅγιοι," an interpretation for which the exclamation of the prayer for the dedication of the temple speaks for ("God eternal and everlasting...),[1554] which equates "τοὺς ἁγίους" with precious martyrs: "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις, τοῖς ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἀθλήμασι τιμίοις μάρτυσιν ἐπαναπαύῃ, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν..." (For you our God are holy and rest upon the holy ones, the contests of the precious martyrs on your behalf, and to you we send up glory...). Thus, God's temple made by hands is turned into a symbol and type of God's dwelling not made by hands and true temple, the Church of his blessed ones according to the psalmic verse, "Ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁσίων" (His praise is in the assembly of the blessed)[1555] (Psalm 149:1) and the epistle text, "For we are the temple of the living God, as God said, 'I will dwell in them and walk among them and I will be their God and they will be my people'"[1556] (2 Corinthians 6:16).

And for us to return to the original question. Of the two possible interpretations of the phrase, "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου"—"Blessed is the gate of your sacred temple"[1557] or "Blessed is the entrance–entry–of your holy priests or of your holy people"[1558]—the simpler and less theological interpretation is the more likely. Namely, this is about a blessing of the gate of the sanctuary (τῆς πύλης τοῦ ἱεροῦ)—the so-called beautiful gate (τῆς ὡραίας πύλης)—from which the celebrants will enter the holy bēma.[1559]

1553. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 54.

1554. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἀΐδιος..."

1555. Modified translation from NETS.

1556. "ὑμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε ζῶντος, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός... καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι λαός."

1557. "Εὐλογμένη ἡ πύλη τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ σου."

1558. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος—ἡ εἰσόδευση—τῶν ἁγίων ἱερέων σου ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου λαοῦ σου."

1559. Here, Phountoulēs makes clear that the "gate," namely, "entrance of the holies" (εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων) or sacred temple (later, the bēma), was blessed. As the scholar Juan Mateos states, "Τῶν ἁγίων, in our opinion, must be interpreted

as the genitive of τὰ ἅγια ('sancta,' 'holy place,' 'sanctuary,' 'temple,'), a frequent name in the Old Testament for the temple of Jerusalem. The translation 'entrance of your saints' instead of 'entrance into your sanctuary' does not seem to fit in the context. 'Your saints' would be an old name for the Christian people, and in no case would it be said of the clergy alone," Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 166. The latter is an English translation and updating of Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine: Étude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971), 81–82. See also the discussion in question 170 and the analysis of "τὰ ἅγια" in question 229.